

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1902.

NO. 10.

The Social Utilization of Crime.*



SCIENTIFIC study regards crime as the expression of a biological and psychological personality, acting in a physical and social environment. This standpoint radically changes the mode of thought and feeling in regard to criminals and, consequently, the manner of dealing with them.

From the innumerable centuries of primitive society to the end of the nineteenth century, crime has always been regarded, judged, hated and attacked as an act of wickedness. But according to the scientific facts and abstractions of anthropology and criminal sociology, crime is simply a natural phenomenon, more or less noxious and more or less clearly pathological.

The same revolution of ideas and feelings took place in regard to insanity after the scientific study of mental disease and of the insane by Pinel and Chiarugi. Insanity, until 1801, looked upon as the result of voluntary deviation from "the path of virtue and godliness" (by the physician Heinroth), is now accepted as a natural phenomenon of a more or less noxious and more or less clearly pathological nature.

The two modes of regarding those abnormal bio-social actions result necessarily in a radical difference of social reaction against crime and insanity. Prisons, chains, and instruments of torture correspond to the old conception of insanity. The scientific ideas on mental aberration have happily substituted for them the various asylums, from those without personal and painful restrictions to those in which "open doors" and village colonies with field or industrial labor are the principal factors of sanitation.

The same evolution is inevitable in regard to crime. So long as we regard crime in the light of personal malfaisance, punishment is the logical consequence. The character of the instru-

*Delivered at the International Congress of Criminology and revised by the author for the International Socialist Review.

ments of chastisement may have become milder, as Howard says, especially in their outward appearance, but legislators, judges, and public opinion are for the greater part still led by the same train of ideas which the Laws of Manu determined for so many centuries: "In order to assist the kings in their functions, God created the Genius of chastisement. . . . Chastisement rules the human race, chastisement protects them, chastisement wakes while the human race sleep, chastisement is justice."

However, when we regard crime as a natural effect, the same as insanity, suicide, and disease, then the theoretical and practical conclusions derived are entirely different. Theoretically, all ideas of moral responsibility (the reflection of free will and wilful wickedness) become untenable and nothing remains but the social responsibility of the criminal (and of every other individual for any and all good or evil acts) toward society. Practically, penalties cease to be the universal panacea for crime, and the violent and illusory force of repression gives way naturally to the less easy and less simple, but more effective and useful force for individuals as well as for the collectivity, the force of elimination or preventive attenuation by society of the anthropological, physical and social causes of criminality. Society abandons all ideas and feelings of vengeance, hate and chastisement in regard to criminals and devises means of prevention against crime as well as against insanity, epidemics, alcoholism, and so forth. And penal justice becomes a sort of social dispensary for such crimes and misdemeanors as could not be hindered by the preventive measures of society. Likewise sanitary preventives against infectious diseases do not succeed in doing away with sporadic cases and individual diseases, although they succeed in reducing the number and intensity of epidemics.

It is clear that there will be a number of intermediate stages, in theory and practice, between the present conception of penal justice, the survival of long centuries of prejudice, and the future preventive service for the protection of society, which will endeavor to indemnify the victims when the offense was small and committed by a harmless person, and to segregate for an unlimited time a criminal who is unfit for social life and dangerous.

As a matter of fact, a theoretical evolution is felt even in the scientific study of criminality and sets forth different aspects of crime as a natural product of society.

Albrecht maintained at the first international congress of criminal anthropology (Rome, 1885) that crime is a product of "biological conditions."

Durckheim added in 1893 that crime is a product of "social conditions."

Lombroso spoke in 1895 of the "benefits of crime."

And if we call normal whatever is constant, and if we believe that even sickness may have some useful counteraction on the individual and on the collectivity, then it is clear that in these statements, however paradoxical they may seem, there is a grain of truth. The practical conclusion at which we arrive through this conception of crime, apart from all sentimental survivals of subjective aversion, is the possibility of making a criminal socially useful.

The classic Romagnosi said that a decrease of criminality in a certain country may also be due to a decrease of national energy. This is true, and it makes Lombroso's idea of the utilization of criminals more precise and exact, if we make the distinction, which I have made in other places, between abnormities of involution and abnormities of evolution.

Criminals are always abnormal individuals. But there are abnormals by involution, who have degenerate, egoistical and savage tendencies and commit crimes of violence or cunning from which no social utility can possibly be derived, such as murder for the sake of vengeance, for theft, etc., criminal assault, deception of poor confiding creatures, etc. And there are abnormals by evolution who also violate the laws of present society, but for motives of progress and altruism, and who may individually give evidence of these tendencies, which are on the whole useful, by noxious, violent or, perhaps, in rare cases, fraudulent acts.

Evidently criminal energy can be led systematically and effectively into channels that will make it less noxious or more useful for society only in the case of evolutionary criminals. It may also be utilized, but on a much smaller scale, in the case of degenerate criminals. This can be realized during their segregation for an unlimited time after committing a crime, by abolishing the absurd isolation in cells and employing them at useful labor in the fresh air, with medical and hygienic treatment. This has been done, for some years, with mild lunatics. But it is manifest that the utilization of the criminal through a new social, judiciary, and administrative conception which utilizes human energy for the benefit of society, instead of stamping out the hated and contaminated individual, can be realized on a large scale with evolutionary criminals alone. They are, moreover, much more numerous than degenerate criminals.

At present a countless army of individuals are thrown out of place, socially reduced, persecuted, prevented from developing, and become violators of the law, rebels, "enemies of society," against whom the "public vengeance" and "the sword of inexorable justice" is invoked—merely because they do not find in this society of ours, in this medley of misery, conventional lies, bureaucratic, military, and academical institutions, the open road on

which they may employ their psycho-physical energies in a normal manner.

In the field of physiology we are acquainted with the phenomenon of nervous deviation, illustrated by Darwin. A discharge of nervous energy which finds its normal road obstructed, spreads and makes use of more or less distant side tracks. For instance, if one is hindered by respect, fear, or some other cause, from laughing, he discharges the nervous current by pinching his fingers, legs, etc.

The same thing takes place in the social organism. An individual that is prevented by poverty, family relations, lack of education, unfavorable domicile, etc., from developing his endowments and energies in a normal mode of activity, expresses his individuality through bio-social by-ways, such as crime, insanity, suicide, or alcoholism. For instance, a man who is forced to discontinue his trade as a butcher becomes a murderer (abnormal by involution). A man to whom the sight of blood is not repugnant may become a surgeon, or a man who is prevented from freely expressing his ideas may become a conspirator, a sectarian, etc. (abnormals by evolution). In England we observe, e. g., how spinsters who cannot find expression for their energies and altruistic inclinations in marriage and family life, find an equivalent and a conductor for their energies in works of charity, in temperance propaganda, in protection of animals, in religious devotions, etc. It is also notorious that many soldiers (even the bravest of them) are simply abnormal individuals, unfit for any methodical and useful work, whose moral and social sense is feebly developed, so that for them cruelty is often inseparable from courage.

From these general remarks it is evident that it will not be possible to formulate a list of practical measures by which the social utilization of crime could be realized, such as I have furnished for penal substitutes in order to give practical illustrations of social preventives against crime. The first step toward the social utilization of criminals must be a radical and profound change of public thought and feeling in regard to crime and criminals. This change must begin in the minds of legislators and judges, and can only come by the slow and gradual infiltration of the scientific ideas on the natural and social generation of crime. In spite of the assistance given by partial experiences with reforms of penal legislation, and in spite of the eloquent testimony on the abnormality of criminals which the facts are daily forcing on the attention of the public, this radical and profound change finds much greater difficulties in the way of its realization and extension than were experienced by the ideas due to the initiation of the classic school of jurists (Beccaria) and the

classic school of penal service (Howard). For the latter aimed only at reforms. They did not touch the theory or practice of penal justice, but started from the same old premise of the free will and moral responsibility of the criminal as the condition and measure of his responsibility before penal law. And yet less than a century was required to make the ideas of Beccaria and Howard the accepted standard against the medieval ideas on this subject.

The conception of crime as a natural phenomenon, which may be socially useful (in abnormals by evolution) and made more or less serviceable to society, constitutes a complete overthrow of the traditional mode of thinking and feeling. And therefore we cannot expect that the progress of this new conception in the world of scientists, legislators, judges and public opinion will be very rapid. But every step ahead in this manner of seeing things, however small it may be, prepares the way for the final transformation of the antiquated function of vengeance and chastisement into a social dispensary for the prevention of crime, backed up by the irresistible impulse of daily facts and of the disastrous effects of so-called penal justice.

The social utilization of crime—which will pass first through the phase of unconscious and tentative,* later through that of systematic realization, will have become a social habit and the result of a true conception of life and social arrangement as a whole. Justice will thereupon cease to be a more or less bloody chamber of horrors with tools of torture, in order to become an expression and practice of public life and conscience.

This will be completely realized—through partial and limited changes during the stage of transition from antiquated to new penal justice—by a social arrangement which will include economic conditions as well as the normal and intellectual expressions of human life. Such an arrangement will necessarily restrict the antiquated and always violent penal justice to a minimum, and assure an ever broader and deeper space to the realization of a sincere and spontaneous social justice.

Enrico Ferri.

(Translated by E. Untermann.)

*As examples of such empirical institutions, which are the enlightening forerunners of the future, I quote the proposition of Girardin (*Le droit de punir*, 1871) to abolish all measures of penal repression and to oppose nothing else to crime and criminals but the sanction of public opinion. More recently Morache (*Revue scientifique*, May, 1901) recommends pardoning as a treatment of criminals. But it is clear that these measures (public opinion, pardon) are not safeguards against all criminals and against the most dangerous of them.

Art and Socialism.



T is right and just that all men should have work to do which shall be worth doing, and be of itself pleasant to do; and which should be done under such conditions as would make it neither over-wearisome nor over-anxious." So said William Morris.

For the new impulse that he gave to art Morris drew much of his inspiration from the Medieval Ages, and pointing to the products of that time, the beautiful Gothic structures, the marvelously bound books and handsome tapestries, he explained that these were only possible where men worked with a certain amount of freedom to develop the spirit of workmanship and to put into material form the ideas that were in them.

It is upon a physiological basis that this "spirit of workmanship" rests. All organisms present two well-defined states. The normal individual is so constituted that periods of inactivity necessary for rest and rebuilding of tissues must be followed by periods of activity. If either of these conditions is carried to an extreme, that is, if work is kept up frequently to the point of exhaustion, or the body remains in a state of inactivity, the organism is injured, and when this is long continued it fails to act and react normally.

These periods of energy are characterized by a desire to make or create something. Work is then a pleasure until the cells of the body again become wasted and the organs require rest. This creative desire is known as the spirit of workmanship. It is illustrated not alone in the work of constructing buildings or machines of wood and steel, or the weaving of yards of fabrics, but also in the work called play of the child, piling up its heaps of sand or blocks.

Where freedom to thus exercise this creative instinct exists men combine three elements in their work. The object they produce serves first some useful purpose, it has at the same time the power of giving pleasure to others, through its beauty of form or color or texture, and, finally, the maker has had pleasure in addition through the process of putting into action his power of creating.

It was to such work done by the free-associated medieval guildsmen that we owe the cathedrals, with their curious combinations in wood and stone, their great rose windows with the simple but beautiful traceries and their quaint figures and gargoyles. In the brains of the craftsmen the plan of the work was evolved, with tools and materials they wrought day after day to complete their

plan; time was not taken into consideration, profit on the labor was unknown. The object of the work was to produce something that, while it pleased the eye of the observer, served also some useful end and had been created with labor pleasant and interesting to the worker.

It is true that the guildsmen suffered from the restrictions of oppressive lords and too stringent guild rules. We find Morris deploring this and showing where, in consequence, their work was often defective, but pointing out that, on the other hand, they were free to plan and work out in wood and stone, in leather or thread, their original designs.

In the center of Brussels is located the city square that Victor Hugo called the most beautiful square in the world. On one side stand the Gild buildings erected in the 15th century, and on the other the City Hall, one of the most perfect remaining examples of Gothic architecture. From top to ground this is one vast piece of art. Nothing can be more delicate than the lace work in stone that covers this building. Carved figures occupy every niche, and on close examination they are found perfect in every part.

"In those elder days of art
Builders wrought with greatest care
Each minute and unseen part."

Visit some old cathedral, as Notre Dame. Here is a structure that took generations in its building and was never completed. Vast in size, it has a dignity and beauty that is unknown to modern structures.

Of this period Morris said, "I have come thoroughly to understand the manner of work under which the art of the Middle Ages was done, and that it is the only manner of work which can turn out popular art; only to discover that it is impossible to work in that manner in this profit-grinding society. So on all sides I am driven toward revolution as the only hope."

Art no less than literature, ethics and education has been the product of its surroundings. Taine, in handling the philosophy of Art says, "The productions of the human mind, like unto those of living nature, can only be explained by their environment."

What was it that made possible the beauty of Greek sculpture and architecture? It was due partly to the fact that nowhere else in the world were there to be found such white and rich quarries of marble. But it was due, also, to there existing in Greece a populace that appreciated and intelligently criticised and understood the statuary and the buildings.

The creator of any of these things knew that he created not for a favored few but for all the citizens of the Republic. Such

another time of popular art will only exist when conditions have made possible a like intelligent people. There was no exclusiveness about the Greek art; even the slave that Aristotle regarded as little more than a machine could see the beauties of the Pantheon.

In all this, Greek and medieval art differs widely from the so-called art of to-day. The conception that arises in the mind of the mass of the people at mention of the word art is of art galleries, with their collection of pictures and statuary, or of private collections of these shut up in the homes of individuals, or of the opera, with its orchestra and singers. Art represents to the laboring man the work of a small part of the leisure class, who are able to produce or hire produced for them, these pictures and statues and operas, because they are freed from more irksome toil by the labor of the great body of the people.

Genuine art is rare to-day. A good part of what is said to be art was created with no attempt to please the eye or meet the criticism of the people, but to appeal to the taste of an exclusive few and while away their ennui. Under these conditions the larger part of the "artistic" things are fads or playthings, and show none of that deep universal spirit of creativeness that marked the products of the 13th and 14th centuries.

Whether we speak of art in the narrow meaning as consisting of the making of beautiful pictures and tapestries, or in the broader sense that dwells on the necessity of original deliberative work on the part of the artisan that would enable him to take pleasure in and add beauty to his products—in either case the divorce between art and the common life is well-nigh complete.

If we turn from the work of the artisan to his home and daily life, it is at once plain that no opportunity exists to-day for the worker to surround himself with anything but ugliness. Take for example the buildings in which the laborer lives. Go into that part of the city where the workers reside, and note the deadening, dismal effect of the long rows of red brick flats so similar that one must count the doors to find his own home.

In the furnishing of his house lack of means compels the worker to buy only the cheap and shoddy carpets, and the disagreeable stuffed furniture. On his walls are found gaily-colored chromos, seldom or never any picture of merit.

The amusements of the laborer are of a like character. The plays of Shakspeare, Ibsen or Hauptmann, works of dramatic power, are beyond his reach financially. He must content himself with some cheap farce, poorly acted. If it is music, completely lost to him are the great compositions of Wagner, such as the *Gotterdamerung*, and he is forced to pretend to enjoy the last popular song at some music hall.

What is the reason for all this that, as William Morris said,

"The world is everywhere growing uglier and more commonplace, in spite of the conscious and very strenuous efforts of a small group of people toward the revival of art."

Ruskin early pointed out the effect of our modern commercialism upon art. Commercialism has destroyed the artist workman. He showed that the one and only object of life to-day is to produce goods for commercial profit.

The employer looks upon the process of production as a means by which he may secure surplus values and thus avoid labor. The laborer must look upon the process of production as a way in which he may obtain the wherewithal to live.

The artist that begins life with dreams of putting himself and his best into his pictures, soon finds that there is no sale for his wares, and with feverish haste he forgets art, and in order to live paints the things he finds an uncultured public demand.

The employer looks upon this absence of art in the productive world as a thing impossible to avoid. Under capitalistic production an all-pervading art is impossible, and this is a positive injury to mankind as it proves that the general happiness is thereby decreased. It shows that the working man can have no pleasure in his labor, for art is "the expression of pleasure in the labor of production."

The tendency of the age is to lessen the amount of human labor necessary in production by turning more and more of the processes over to machinery.

We can believe that this will continue until few men comparatively can supply the needs of life. But if this point were reached and society had passed on into the socialist state where profit were unknown and a free higher handicraftsman were again possible we should expect to find men leaving those processes that can be done as well or better by machinery to machinery, but taking back to hand work certain parts of industry that can be far better done by hand. In anything like their old form or completeness the handicrafts can never be revived. Modern civilization has propounded such colossal tasks for industry that they cannot be accomplished at all with the implements and methods of handicraft. The manufacture of a locomotive, a steam crane, or a rapid press, or the building of a river bridge or railroad with its rails and rolling stock, cannot be carried out with anything but powerful mechanical appliances.

The possibilities of education under the changed conditions would be great. While to-day, in order to give proper training to hand and brain it is necessary to establish manual training schools and workshops, under the new regime the production of the standard goods might be utilized in giving such training, lay-

ing a foundation for the more difficult work of designing and executing included under the handicrafts.

For the realization of such an all-pervading art, it is necessary that there exist a public that appreciates and understands its productions; that the artist and the artisan, the designer and maker should be the same; that time be no longer money, but that the workman have sufficient leisure to allow his plan to grow gradually, and that he be supplied with materials, various and of suitable quality, to meet his needs. Such an art is then only possible when the element of profit is removed from labor and economic freedom exists. The futility of all efforts to revive popular art or the handicrafts under present conditions is evident. They may flourish among the few, but they can strike no roots into the life of the people until an economic change has opened the way.

The tendency toward revolt in literature, education and science against existing conditions is accompanied by a like revolt in the field of art. This is seen in pictures like those of Millet, that more and more depict the life, burdens and distresses of the laboring class, and the adverse criticism that such works are subjected to. At a recent dinner given by the German Emperor he is reported as having expressed his repugnance to the works of realists who paint the lives of the poor, such as Liebermann and Uhde. His class bias and consequent dislike of the Social Democracy explain this.

Most consciously revolutionary of all the movements in art was that led by Wm. Morris. Its history is beyond our space. Saddest of all, though, is the fact that the beautiful rugs, rich in colors, and simple in pattern, the choicely bound books, and the furniture, made after the designs of this revolutionary Socialist, are the possessions to-day of that ruling class that he hoped within his time to see lose its power.

May Wood Simons.

Open Letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo.



O his Holiness, Pope Leo XIII.

We most respectfully beg leave to present to Your Holiness the following dissertation suggested by your Encyclical of January 18, 1901. We will point out a few of the inaccuracies contained in the Encyclical, and will also state plainly and at some length the true principles of socialism.

Socialism is a material, an economic science, and its basic principle is expressed in four words, to wit: "Economical production; equitable distribution." By "Economical production" we mean that a system of the best methods for the management of all public utilities should be adopted, and the best appliances, tools and machinery, should be employed, so that we may produce the crop on the farm, the finished article in the workshop, and the product of the mine with the least outlay of human labor. All adult persons shall be required to contribute the necessary minimum time of useful service according to each one's ability. By "equitable distribution" we mean that all persons shall be supplied by the community with an equitable share of common products according to their needs. We will now proceed to point out the only means by which it is possible to put these wise and humane principles into actual practice. God decreed that labor is the only means by which the necessities and comforts of life can be produced. His command, "Thou shalt earn thy bread by the sweat of thy brow," applies to every member of the human race, and renders it indispensably necessary that every individual shall possess unlimited freedom fully to comply with this divine injunction. No person or class of persons shall ever have, or be given, the power to monopolize or control the means or instruments by which labor is made productive of the necessities and comforts of life.

The above are socialist principles which in your Encyclical Your Highness opposes. Your opposition is absolutely wonderful in view of the great self-evident fact that the private ownership of property is exactly what gives the capitalist employer the power by which he takes from the toiler the necessities of life. The capitalist owns the means by which the laborer produces these necessities, and does not allow him in wages enough to keep his family from suffering, and is continually cutting his wages smaller. What will be the feelings and thoughts of Your Holiness' spiritual children when they thoroughly understand the fact that Your Holiness is in favor of the system that places their means of sustaining life in the hands of the greedy capitalist, and that you complain bitterly because they angrily denounce and re-

sent capitalistic oppression. We do not believe that Your Holiness favors such oppression or that you do not desire to promote the best interest of all classes, but you approve the system that leaves it in the power of the avaricious to profit by such oppression. Will the proposition of Your Holiness to "close the controversy" stifle the famishing child's cry for bread, or render the heart of the father insensible, or his ear deaf to those cries, which have, up to this moment, thrilled his being with excruciating agony? Or, rather, will not that "father-love" with which God has filled his heart, irresistibly impel him to redouble his determination to fearlessly fight to the death the colossal injustice? Will not the fact of his finding in Your Highness so unexpected though formidable an adversary, be an additional strong incentive to greater and greater activity in his efforts to secure industrial freedom for the toiling portion of humanity? Your "Christian Democracy" is not democratic, because you make it tolerate "class distinctions;" and it is positively un-Christian because you make it approve of the system that places the laborer in the power of those who can and do take from him the greater portion of the products of his labor.

Your Holiness may ask how we will prove all these statements to be true. We will prove it by the fact that Your Holiness approves of the system of the private ownership of the means of production and distribution, the system under which such things are possible, and under which they are also inevitable. He who owns the means by which the necessities of life are obtainable, owns the life of the user of those means, and the laborer thus owned is a veritable wage slave, and Your Holiness approves of this, the most complete system of human slavery that was ever devised by the ingenuity of human greed. The master has entire control of the wages of the laborer and also of the prices of all that the laborer consumes, and what he fails to extort from him by cutting down his wages, he takes by raising the prices of the things on which the toiler must live. Of the things necessary to sustain life are, first, food; second, clothing; third, shelter. Our Savior complained that "the foxes have holes and the birds of the air nests, but the son of man hath no where to lay his head." The private ownership of public utilities or capitalism, the present system, forces the toiler of to-day down into that hungry, homeless condition of which our Savior complained. "As ye did it unto the least of these, ye did it unto Me." On the "last day" to whom will the great Judge of Heaven and Earth address these terrifying words: "I was hungry and you gave not to eat. I was naked and you did not clothe Me, I was homeless and a stranger and you took Me not in?" Will it be to the socialist, who imperatively demands that every human being, without exception, shall have un-

limited freedom to use the means by which the products of his or her labor will enable them to feed, clothe and harbor themselves; or will they be addressed to the "upper class" who rob the toilers of from seventy to eighty-three per cent of what their labor produces?

Your Holiness says: "No political tendency must be given Christian Democracy." This advice will be very pleasing to the wealthy, and if all who live by labor are strictly obedient to Your Holiness, the capitalists will have no opposition to their exploitation. They will continue to hold and control the law-making power, and by going through the farce of popular elections, in which they obtain their majorities by deceiving, bribing and intimidating the voter, and by fraudulent count of the votes, they pretend that they are the choice of the people. Notwithstanding these excessive corruptions the existence of which Your Holiness admits and deplures, you say "the word Christian Democracy must have no political signification only that of beneficent Christian action on behalf of the people." Your Holiness forbids the proletariat making any effort to inaugurate an economic system, an industrial form of government, under which such corruption could not exist. Your Holiness condemns the wish and effort of the socialists to own even "the very implements necessary for gaining livelihood." Is it possible that your Holiness thus proclaims to the toiling Catholics of the world that it is wrong for them to own, or even wish to own, the means by which they are enabled to earn, the necessities of life for themselves and their families? Will they be willing to suffer without protest, the hardships and privations that are inevitable under the system of the capitalist ownership of all the productive industries? That the private ownership of the means of production and distribution is the cause of all poverty and the suffering resulting from it, all dishonesty in dealing, and all crimes committed for the gain of money or property is easily seen and known by every observing person.

If one but takes careful note of the vast areas of the most valuable land owned and kept out of cultivation by the wealthy, the exorbitant rent charged the tiller of the soil by the land owner, the smallness of the wages paid by employers in the factory and mine, the exorbitant prices the consumer has to pay for the necessities of life, the heartless cruelty with which mines and factories are closed and laborers are thrown out of employment in order to check production and raise the price of the stock on hand, it is easily seen how complete the control of the life and death of the laborer is in the hands of the capitalist, and how mercilessly he makes use of it. Under public ownership the possibility of such robbery could not exist. Dives would not have the power to refuse "Lazarus" the crumbs that would 'fall from his table."

Lazarus, as Your Holiness says, would feel that "he is a man, not a brute," not a pagan but a Christian. He would be treated free of charge by specialists trained for their work by the public. Under proper sanitary conditions, such cases as that of Lazarus would be very rare, and probably would not exist at all, as they result from a lack of cleanliness. Public baths and sanitariums would soon become common under socialism and their operation would prevent most of the diseases resulting from unsanitary conditions.

Again Your Holiness says, "In like manner it is necessary to separate from the idea of the Christian Democracy that other anomaly which consists in making it full of zeal for the welfare of the lower classes and yet neglect the upper, although they are of no less importance for the preservation and perfection of society." "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Socialists are most assuredly full of zeal for the welfare of the lower classes, the weary toiler, the downtrodden, the hungry, the cold and homeless, whose labor has produced all the wealth that is in existence, and who alone are in need of sympathy and assistance. The upper class, who live in luxurious idleness, whose principal occupation is to devise means by which they can enjoy themselves and manage to spend the millions they have extorted from the lower class, seem pretty well able to endure the neglect of which Your Holiness so sympathetically complains. This "lower class," who have toiled for the "upper class" three-fourths of their time, quite fail to discover this debt imposed upon them by the laws of "Christian Charity," which Your Holiness fears and foresees they are planning to neglect. The socialists are wisely and humanely striving to inaugurate an economic system that will easily and abundantly supply the means to gratify every legitimate material want of every human being without exception. Thus is the socialist willing to include the "upper class" as full and equal sharers in the material boon he craves for himself. This fact is universally proclaimed by socialist writers as the beneficent and inevitable result of the collective ownership or co-operative principle. It is therefore unaccountable that Your Holiness should fail to recognize so important and so notable a truth. "Although they are of no less importance for the preservation and perfection of society." Just how the idle rich are of importance, and in what manner they add perfection to society, Your Holiness did not explain. God has condemned them in every way, saying: "Woe be to you rich, for you have your consolation in this world." "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven." This is God's terrible indictment against them, and we fail to see what good purpose they serve. We know that their evil example in vanity of worldly

show has a very wide and baneful influence on the poorer portion of the community.

"Modern industrial inventions, and the marvelous increase in labor-saving and wealth-producing machinery have, under the circumstances but seemed to embitter the conflict." In this, socialists agree with Your Holiness most perfectly. Labor-saving and wealth-producing machinery which, under public ownership, would be a very great blessing by increasing the production of the necessities of life, and by making "less hard the lot of the toiler," under capitalism or private ownership become instruments of the most galling oppressions. "Finally, through the guilty aims of the turbulent, the strife between the rich and proletariat has become envenomed to such a point that States, already disturbed by frequent upheavals, are menaced with the greatest misfortunes." The guilty aims and acts of the robber capitalist class are at once the cause and the alleged excuse of the turbulent 'Anarchist,' for his use of the explosive bomb of destruction, and the poisoned bullet of assassination. The centralization of wealth into the hands of the unscrupulous few is the colossal misfortune that now, more than ever since the downfall of the Roman Empire, menaces society, States, nations, the entire race! "It requires that relations between man and man must retain the form and character God their author gave them." If God gave the rich the character they now and always have had, why does He condemn them and limit their reward to the consolation their riches may afford them? Why does He exclude them from the kingdom of heaven? This sweeping condemnation of the rich by God himself proves to the socialist that their great wealth results from a very dishonest use of the faculty of freewill, and that God is as far from being the author as he is from being the author of any other crimes of which the class of human beings may be guilty. It would be hard indeed if God authorized them to be rich and at the same time closed the gates of heaven against them, "For it therefore justice is absolutely inviolable." Your Holiness knows that it is absolutely impossible for justice to "be inviolable" where one man becomes rich from the proceeds of the labor of others. Your Holiness knows also that it is by paying the laborer less in wages than the value of what his labor produces that wealth is centralized, and men become rich. It is therefore impossible for a man to become rich, without trampling down the laws of justice; for, by one man becoming rich, many are, unavoidably, kept in poverty. This upper class, whom Your Holiness so defends, is guilty of three of the sins crying to heaven for vengeance: "Wilful murder, oppression of the poor, defrauding laborers of their wages." They are the cause of all wars. All wars are inaugurated for financial gain, and are therefore wilfully murderous in their purpose, and in the

fiendish manner in which they are executed. Every human life that is sacrificed in those inhuman conflicts, every home destroyed by them, the hardships and sufferings of all, the families that are ruined and broken up by them, all the privations resulting from the enormous burden of taxes levied on the products of the labor of the toiling class, to pay the colossal war expenses are items in the category of capitalist crimes. The capitalists are also guilty of the crime of "oppressing the poor" by monopolizing all the means by which it is possible to procure the necessities of life, so that the laborer has no possible alternative but to work for them for the starvation wages they will agree to pay. They are likewise guilty of defrauding laborers of their wages, by taking advantage of the working man's necessities, which compel him to accept wages that are only about one-fifth of what his labor produces, and are inadequate to support himself and family. This is the catalogue of terrible crimes of which the "upper class" stands convicted, and whom Your Holiness tells us "are of no less importance for the preservation and perfection of society," than the producers of all wealth, who toil and struggle and die under their system of wholesale exploitation.

The attitude of Your Holiness towards the laboring class, and your mistaken ideas about Socialism, have caused much of the unjust censure of the Catholic Church by socialists, who are prejudiced and, being unaware of its divine origin, fail to distinguish between the truthfulness of its teachings and the mistakes of its members. They look upon it as the greatest human institution on earth, actively opposing the God-given right of the toilers to live by the fruits of their labor. The fact that Your Holiness defends the rich and approves of the system by which the cunning few become wealthy, and the toiling multitude are kept in poverty, makes it appear to them that the Catholic Church is the friend of the rich, and an enemy to economical justice towards the "lower class." Socialists know that their wish and effort to secure to the laborers industrial freedom, are in perfect harmony with the command to "love one's neighbor as one's self." Catholics who oppose socialism, in the opinion of non-Catholics, place the church in the attitude of antagonism to economic justice, which is a very great impediment to the spread of Catholic truth. Those who thus scandalize the church may well fear the "woe" with which the scandal-giver is threatened.

"It seeks only corporal and earthly goods, and to the acquisition and enjoyment of these it limits all human happiness." Yes, socialism "seeks only corporal and worldly goods," for there its jurisdiction absolutely ends. It is strictly and exclusively a material, a bread and butter question. It is the science of economically producing and distributing the necessities and comforts of

life for the whole human family, in the same way, and to the same extent, that God's law requires and permits, in the family of "father, mother and children," of which He was the author. As God, in His family, has established the principle of "From all according to each one's ability," and "to all according to each one's needs," and evidently intended it to be of universal application to all people in all time, as He threatened with hell and exclusion from heaven every person who should violate it; the socialist proposes to bring society back to that condition of universal justice and brotherhood in which God designed it to exist. The diversity in individual capabilities fits different persons to fill the different positions necessarily open and requiring suitable service in every department of well-organized society, and makes people satisfied and pleased with the duties of the position they are best qualified to occupy. The assertion that socialism tends or desires to reduce or bring all people to a "dead level," is a wicked and an extremely absurd slander. Socialism proposes, with the help and permission of God's providence, to restore and to secure forever to every human being the God-given liberty to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow; and to free him forever from the tyranny and robbery that is now practically used by the so-called "upper class," the capitalist parasites of society. The anti-Christian, the "heaven on earth" idea contained in the writings of some socialists, is not socialism, and is as far from being socialism as Dr. Mivert's "happiness in hell" is from being Catholicity. Socialism will, incidentally, be of great benefit to the Catholic Church by making "less hard the lot of those who live by the sweat of their brow, so that they may little by little succeed in insuring the necessities of life," in order "to fulfill freely their moral and religious duties;" "to turn more easily and with greater order to the one thing necessary," that is to say, the supreme good for which we have been created." This quotation from Your Holiness' Encyclical is true, and is a good socialistic argument. It proves that Your Holiness fully recognizes and appreciates the baneful effects of the degrading servitude forced upon the "lower class" by capitalistic oppression. As long as the present system of exploitation by the wealthy continues, the chasm between the rich and the poor will continue to widen, and the toiling millions, the oppressed, whose numbers are ever increasing, can never, by force or by persuasion, be compelled or induced to cease their opposition to it, or to be satisfied with it.

It has long since been known also, that to urge upon the wealthy employers the "duties imposed on them by the laws of Christian charity" and justice is absolutely fruitless, and all the admonitions and anathemas of Your Holiness will be entirely disregarded by them. We have a number of publicly-owned institu-

tions, among which are the city sidewalks and streets, the public highways, the public schools, the city fire department, the postal service and the church. If public ownership is wrong, those utilities should be sold or given into the hands of corporations, who should hasten to place toll gates on the walks and highways, charge those able to pay for education, and exclude from the schools those not able to pay. A good price should be charged for every fire alarm, and the effort to extinguish fires. Postage should be increased so as to pay the owner a fair rate of interest on that enormous cost of the post offices, and a good salary for owning them. If private ownership is the best for the "lower class," the church, the place that ought above all others to be in the proper hands, should be privately owned, so that it could yield a handsome revenue to some capitalist benefactor of the poor. If the advocate of the "inviolability" of private property concede, and perhaps even assert, that the principle should not include institutions of such common and vital necessities as sidewalks, streets, highways, schools, post offices, fire departments and churches, and that these should be supported by the public and open to the free use of the poor and rich alike; what good and sufficient reason will they give for permitting the wealthy capitalist to monopolize and withhold from the laborer the necessities of life, the food, clothing and shelter which his labor has created? The laborer could sustain his life without the use of any of these utilities that are now secured and left open to him by public ownership, but without food and clothing of which he is robbed by private ownership, he cannot live. This is exactly the reason why those things are monopolized. The fact that human life cannot be sustained without them, enables the capitalistic monopolizer to extort a tribute for their use that is both exorbitant and perpetual. The socialist demands universal or collective ownership for the all-sufficient reason that it is the only system under which it is possible for the toiling class to secure to themselves any ownership at all. In the power of overwhelming numbers, and in no other way, can the laboring class hope to successfully compete with the almost irresistible money powers in the hands of the capitalistic trusts that are so thoroughly organized against them. The principle of collective or public ownership is so simple, its necessity so great, and its advantages so self-evident, that it is absolutely incomprehensible that the larger portion of the Hierarchy of the great Catholic Church, with Your Holiness at their head, should fail to at once recognize so stupendous a fact!

W. I. Brown.

The Professional Outlook.

EVEN the ordinary student of history will note that heretofore social progress has been slow, being in most essentials a matter of generations. Now-a-days, since the railway, telegraph, telephone and a thousand inventions have made the nations of the world a constantly narrowing circle of neighbors, the changes of social status and environment are necessarily much more rapid. In a single average lifetime it is possible to recognize and study a remarkable series of transitions in various lines of thought and action.

In such times of transition, when many complex causes combine to bring about social changes, those who first feel the added burden are those most hopelessly crushed under the social mass, the very poor, "the submerged tenth," about whom so much has been written and said, and, until very recently and now very inadequately, so little actually done. Their burden is greater because of the increased stress and struggle of their lives consequent upon the new host of dependents that economic and social changes force downwards into their ranks.

For years after the battle of Waterloo, England supported more paupers than now and at nearly five times the present cost. In 1898 (see *Statesman's Year-book*, 1899) Great Britain maintained 1,025,104 individuals at public expense, being 10,000 more than she cared for in 1888 (Mulhall). The annual expense of caring for her 102,000 paupers for London is one million pound sterling, which sum takes no account of the probably larger amount spent in private charity. Evidences of the outbreak of these forces, the struggling masses of the very poor who "disgrace Christian civilization," are seen in the "bread riots" periodically occurring in all European countries, in the "machine breakings" enacted at the instigation of British workmen, and in the opposition of the ignorant poor to all things that tend to make a living harder—a blind outcry against a time-honored and cruel injustice.

While these are still smarting, little knowing why, (as is well depicted in "No. 5 John Street") those who are lucky enough to have steady employment, the workers of the world, also begin to find work more uncertain and wages smaller; the skilled workman chiefly because of the mighty displacement of his class by improved machinery, privately owned. Then the mercantile class, the legitimate shop-keepers and traders who depend upon the workers for their business, feel the pinching change. Here also should be mentioned the middle-men who live by commissions;

if sales cease, their incomes cease likewise. Then, as the effects of change permeate all classes, the professional people, for similar reasons, are slowly squeezed. Finally, last and least of all, those who have surplus capital, the idle rich, are cognizant of the social upheaval.

The classes just specified are mentioned as a matter of custom, but are entirely arbitrary and merely for purposes of illustration, since in a purely capitalistic society, such as all "civilized" countries now present, all who do not possess capital, i. e., money or its immediate equivalent, are workers. There are no other classes but these two, capitalists and workers!

Most professional people, whether ministers, lawyers, physicians, teachers, journalists, architects, etc., are workers for their daily bread, as much as those commonly so-called, and considered socially beneath them. Yet these same professional people, being able by the exercise of their capital, i. e., brains, to command larger incomes than ordinary workers, do not like to be classed as such, but rather with the other capitalists as exploiters of the workers.

This article will attempt to show some of the causes that are constantly depressing the professions, socially speaking, so that by the sheer force and stress of events and from no inherent fault of their own, their former position as exploiters is fast becoming mere pretense. The only exceptions to this general fact are those individuals attached in some way to huge corporate interests, those who exploit their own kind, or have combined to exploit the people in wholesale lots.

While all professionals generally speaking suffer from the causes about to be mentioned, the medical profession is the one most familiar to me and therefore the one to which I will refer hereafter.

For several generations after "the three learned professions" began to have representatives in each community, these representatives were counted with the gentry. Each well-established position in theology, law or medicine was equivalent to a landed estate, and indeed often led up to that desideratum. Only fifty years ago and still in a few isolated towns, the local physician ranked with the clergyman, teacher, and perhaps the lawyer, as one of the monitors of the place, looked up to and consulted upon all public and private occasions. Now-a-days and for a decade or more all this has changed, or is rapidly changing, into a society from which the old-time professional man has altogether disappeared.

Some of the causes for these changes are as follows; causes that are constantly gaining importance and momentum, like a snow-ball rolling down hill in soft snow:

First. The constantly increasing number of physicians, their ranks being filled from all walks in life by those who are seeking what has heretofore apparently been "an easy way of earning a living." Physicians have themselves to blame for accepting the apparent commercial demand for more and yet more doctors by establishing colleges in every large city until in each community there is an over-supply. In round numbers from the 150 medical colleges of the United States and Canada—graduates of the latter country overflow into this—over 5,000 medical men and women go forth each year to encompass the land and its people. The only official directory of this territory, published every three years with great accuracy, gives over 100,000 names of the three leading schools of medical practice, i. e., Allopathic, Homeopathic and Eclectic, but of course makes no mention of the nearly equal number of "irregular" practitioners of all sorts—of whom more anon. If these 100,000 physicians did all the medical and surgical business for America's 76,000,000 there would be an average of 760 citizens apiece for each one, an average that would afford a fair income to each practitioner.

But many circumstances tend to cut down that average, even to 300 or less apiece in many large cities; and these circumstances are among the further causes I am trying to enumerate as constantly dragging down our profession.

Second. The constant abuse of business decency and common ethics by a large class of so-called "irregular" practitioners. Everyone knows, and none better than the physicians themselves, how widely this is true and that our profession probably suffers more than any other.

The constantly increasing pressure for the elusive dollar, and the easy gullibility of the average person in matters medical, makes such practice common everywhere. In all the cities, and in smaller towns by itinerant venders, numerous advertisers, promising all sorts of quick and permanent relief for all the ills of the flesh without regard to "age, sex or previous condition of servitude," rake in the shekels at every down-town corner. Each legitimate advance in science is immediately seized by these people as bait for the ignorant and unwary. For instance, an X-ray machine is made to deceive quite intelligent people with the idea that through it can be seen the exact condition of the lungs, liver, kidneys and other soft organs, for an ample consideration; whereas the honest physician knows that but little except bony tissues or other solid substances can be shown by this instrument and that by very shadowy outlines.

Third. The methods of some of the respectable and regular members of the profession in their mad chase for revenue are not always on a high ethical plane, and have therefore tended to dis-

credit the whole profession in the eyes of the public. The offices of such too often present the appearance of a curiosity shop, being bright with nickel-plated machines and instruments so arranged and displayed as to impress the beholder, and not always accompanied with the necessary skill and knowledge in application. Then, too, surgery and surgical work has been so advertised in the public press that people have been actually frightened into allowing themselves to be cut up in any and all parts and for all purposes, under the specious plea of a thorough investigation and understanding of the disease and removal of diseased tissue. If disease were purely a material and objective affair this would bring remarkable and ideal results and the triumphs of modern surgery, which I would not belittle, would indeed be complete. But, because the world is beginning to perceive that disease is based upon moral or psychic conditions, there is setting in a healthy reaction from this cutting which will result finally in the stranding of many surgeons upon the beach of Mr. Cleveland's "innocuous desuetude."

Moreover, under this count, even the simple medical man, the old-style, most useful and worthy family physician comes in for a share of the blame, and is certainly receiving his share if not more than his share of the punishment. His sin has consisted in pouring quantities of nauseous medicines into his patients for so long, and with such indifferent results, that the people have begun to repudiate, not only the drug given but the one who prescribes the drugs. His patients have learned that the physician has no belief in drugs himself, and are imitating his agnosticism very closely. Hence the success of all the drugless systems of healing, such as mental, divine, magnetic, the osteopaths and Christian Scientists. The only ones who still have faith in medicines are the homeopaths, who prescribe upon a definite law of cure. But many people see very little difference between their minute doses and no medicine at all. So rife is this agnosticism and empiricism, at least in the cities, that a recent investigation in my own city by a friend, a well-known dentist, showed that ninety per cent of prescriptions sent to certain popular drug stores called for proprietary medicines (not patent medicines).

What respect can people have for those who so abuse drugs, using such as have an unknown composition in a most careless and lazy manner?

Fourth. Another prime reason for the decay of the medical craft is the immense capital and enterprise of the wholesale and retail drug trade. These are constantly engaged in inducing both the doctors and the people by all manner of advertisements (some of these most shamefully indecent) and all sorts of street literature to use whatever drugs they, the manufacturers, find

to bring the most profit or are the most seductive in their origin and appearance, without regard to their well-ascertained or authenticated effects. Unless one has actually seen the bushels of penny literature which yearly come to each physician's office he will doubt the methods of the drug-pushers, all "inside strictly professional and ethical lines" as each advertisement is careful to tell us. This latter phrase means that the dear public are not supposed to know of these medicines until the doctors choose to tell them, but the financial pressure is generally so great that the laity soon learn to use them of their own accord, and from a commercial rather than a scientific standpoint. It is probably a fact that no people on earth, civilized or otherwise, use so many drugs or maintain so many drug stores as Americans. Incidentally, it seems strange that we who boast of being the most civilized nation in the world should sell the most whisky, drugs and tobacco (arranged in the order of their harmfulness)! Does this constitute civilization, and should drugs also be crowded down the waiting throats of the uncivilized?

Fifth. The several cults, or so-called fads, that have arisen in protest against the physicians and their associated follies and hypocrisies, also plainly threaten the very existence of the profession. Some only are mentioned.

The "Ralston Health Club," which claimed two years ago over a million membership, inculcates the first principles of diet and hygiene in such a fantastic and ingenious way that it attracts an increasing number of sensible people, although it also teaches several errors. People who follow its tenets need a physician semi-occasionally, and drugs seldom if ever.

The rapidly increasing Osteopaths, who have modified and adapted to their needs the established Swedish-movement cure, the rubbers or masseurs, the clairvoyants and a hundred more, are all distinct workers in the medical field, not counted regular, whose gleanings necessarily draw from the harvest of the so-called medical profession. These people accomplish apparent cures, else people would not employ them any length of time, and will probably, many of them at least, ultimately find a legitimate place among true healers. Yet their very number and popular credence is, from historical data, prime evidence of the decay of the pre-existing medical art.

Most prominent in this list, and most rapidly increasing among those who are able and heretofore willing to employ physicians, are the Christian Scientists. From incomplete knowledge only, I judge that these most threaten the practice of medicine because they practically train the divine mind in man to absolutely live without the thought of evil or illness, and therefore, as this mind governs everything and is the only real thing, sin

and sickness do and will continue in increasing ratio to disappear utterly from the earth.

All these elements are aggressively destructive of old medicine, boldly oppose and ignore all medical legislation and literally have "no use for doctors."

Sixth. Nothing has so debauched and pauperized the people, medically speaking, in the cities at least, and taken away utterly their inclination to properly recompense their physician, as the medical charities, the hospitals and free dispensaries, established generally by college teachers to gain material for their students. This evil the doctors themselves have fostered until like the camel's head in the tent, it is likely to be followed by full occupation. Yet it is probably a step towards socialism that will never be retraced, since people once accustomed to free medicine, whether by private charity or by municipal or state gratuity, will never wish to pay individually for the same. Indeed, this is the actual position taken by the Socialist party everywhere, a plank in their international platform, i. e., free medical advice and treatment to all. If "socialism is coming, and coming soon," as Dr. Herron says, the profession must be prepared for this radical change in their business.

Not to prolong this enumeration of causes to too great length, last, and for the average practitioner the greatest, is

Seventh. The constantly lessening incomes of the "middle classes," and their consequent inability to pay physicians' fees. The man who is supporting his family upon \$100 or less each month, and this is unfortunately true of four-fifths of the population, has no money left for the unusual and always unfortunate expenses of illness; and by the present squeezing-out process the number of small incomes increases every week. It has always been difficult to collect physicians' fees among every-day people, mainly for the patent reason that their money barely goes around when they remain well. This is more true every day, and will continue to be true, until the social machinery is so changed as to work justice to all. This fact is recognized by the railroads and other great corporations when they take out from their employees' wages a certain small sum per month which entitles them to free medical and surgical care individually and for their families at half or less the usual rates. So also where men are employed temporarily in large numbers on various constructions.

With these and other causes tending to depress the practitioners of medicine, socially and financially, and all other professions as well, what is the duty of the individual suffered therefrom?

It seems to me, and this is the reason why this article appears in an avowed socialistic instead of a medical journal, that the

physician is better placed to view the social changes from an impartial standpoint than almost any other person, and that therefore he should, while his occupation still remains to him, be a missionary of the new social gospel that the world must learn, and that right quickly, if our present civilization is not to perish from earth in the most violent revolution of the ages.

"A Practitioner."

Minneapolis, Minn.

Sociological Laws and Historical Fatalism.

THE materialistic interpretation of history has lately been assailed from many socialist quarters. The literature on the subject of "historical" materialism in German, Russian and Italian is growing hourly, and a sentiment is steadily gaining strength in favor of a "return to Kant."

What is the cause of this reversion towards Idealism? It is the seeming contradiction between the theoretical materialism and the practical idealism of Marxist Socialism. On the one hand, the theory of Marx teaches that the mode of production, with the economic relations corresponding to it, is the primary factor in the growth of society; all other phenomena of social life are but the derivatives of that primary cause. As the mode of production changes, all institutions and ideas must change, in obedience to inexorable "historical" laws.

On the other hand, Socialist parties are busy all over the world spreading the ideas of Socialism, which implies the assumption that their propaganda is itself a factor in the transformation of capitalist society. No one thinks of organizing a society to assist in the eclipse of the moon—says Stammler (author of "Wirtschaft und Recht"). If Socialism is as inevitable as the movement of celestial bodies, where is the sense of hustling about it, let alone making personal sacrifices for it? It will all come in due time.

And now comes the orthodox commentator, the rightful successor of the theologian who in bygone ages strained his ingenuity to reconcile divine omniscience and omnipotence with divine mercy. There is no contradiction, he says. History is not made automatically; it is made by men. The development of the mode of production shapes the minds of men, and the minds of men then reshape economic conditions. Capitalism beget the Socialist party and the Socialist party will beget the co-operative commonwealth.

Granting it, for the sake of argument, is it not evident that it means letting in Idealism by the back door? It substitutes the reciprocal action of material and ideal factors for the monistic view upheld by uncompromising historical materialism. It makes little difference that Engels "himself" suggested this amendment in the early 90's. His suggestion merely implied the admission that the early presentation of the theory by Marx and himself allowed of a more rigorous construction and, at any rate, of one differing from that expressed in the amendment.

Let us examine whether the earlier—call it the “crude”—view is really in conflict with the practice of Marxism.

The distinctive feature of nineteenth century philosophy is the proposition that the development of human society is subject to certain laws, which must be discovered by the study of society. In this the nineteenth century view differs from the rationalistic political philosophy of the eighteenth century, which considered all past history a series of blunders due to lack of correct comprehension of the true needs of society. From the rationalistic point of view the fabric of society can be remodelled at any moment, to suit the plans of the social reformer, provided he can find a sufficient following. This belief underlies all the revolutionary movements of the first half of the nineteenth century, which followed the traditions of the French revolution; and even to-day it expresses the view-point of what might be termed in Marxian phraseology “vulgar” socialism. The opposite view originated with the German historical school of jurisprudence in the beginning of the nineteenth century, as a conservative reaction against the revolutionary tendencies of the day, but it gradually gained universal acceptance and was ultimately made the corner-stone of scientific socialism by Karl Marx.

The views of students differ as to the nature of the laws of social development; the positivists take the development of human ideas as the basis of their study of society; Buckle, the development of science; Marx, the development of the mode of production. They all agree, however, in the fundamental proposition, viz.: that society follows in its development certain laws, which must be discovered by science.

This naturally raises the question, What is the status of the individual before the laws of social evolution? If every step in the development of society is predetermined by a social law, then no room seems to be left to the individual; an attempt to change the laws of social evolution must prove as futile as a rebellion against the law of gravitation, while adjusting individual activity to the ascertained laws of social evolution means no more than trying to assist in the eclipse of the moon. This leads to Oriental fatalism and acquiescence in things as they are. It may be urged as an objection that Idealism, which holds that human ideas are the motive power of social progress, must stimulate an active public spirit. It seems obvious, however, that if the development of our ideas and our resultant activity are determined by immutable “laws of history,” then it really matters not whether the origin of our ideas is psychological or economic. To put it bluntly, if the inevitable course of history produces a sort of a mental epidemic which impels the multitude to play their parts in the carnival of history, where is the sense for a student of the “laws of

history" to don the harlequin's garb and join in the procession? Unless the effort of the individual can add something which may affect, be it to an infinitesimal degree, the movement of society, acquiescence in things as they are is the only "scientific" course of conduct. It may be said, perhaps, that those who do things do not waste their time in "worthless discussions" over such philosophical subtleties; an idealist, however, would scorn this argument, which would mean that only lower forms of consciousness (social sub-consciousness, so to speak) would be considered among the factors of social progress. A critical mind, to be active, must believe that his personal acts are productive of effects, which must fail to materialize if he abstains from acting. But that which may be done or undone at the discretion of the individual is obviously beyond the pale of "historical necessity." Let it not be said that the individual is not "free," that he is impelled to act by psychological necessity. One of the constituent elements of this psychological necessity is the belief of the individual that his personal efforts are an independent factor capable of shaping the course of events. Any theory (whether materialistic or idealistic) which destroys this belief, deadens the psychological impulse to act and lays the foundation to Oriental fatalism.

It is quite plain that the blame is indeed not against economic materialism alone; the stigma of fatalism attaches to all theories alike, whether materialistic or idealistic, which maintain the existence of "laws of history." Does it not seem perplexing, however, that while every discovery of a new law of nature has so wonderfully increased the power of Man over Nature, the discovery of the laws of social evolution should have the contrary effect of making Man a helpless chip on the sea of history?

The confusion proceeds from the ambiguous use of the term "history." On the one hand, it denotes a chronicle or record of past events; on the other hand, it stands for "philosophy of history," as understood in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century, or for what has come to be known since Auguste Comte, as "sociology."

History as the chronicle of past events never repeats itself, and where there is no repetition there can be no law. Our so-called "laws of history" are generalizations from a number of similar phenomena; like every other generalization, it is a scientific abstraction, which disregards all concrete variance between actual phenomena. It is precisely through this disregard for variations in particular cases that the law is made applicable to all cases. The botanist who studies the growth of a plant does not undertake to account for all the variations in the shape of its leaves; his laws are general, all that which is particular is beyond the scope of scientific laws. So in philosophy of history we dis-

regard chronology, biographical episodes and all matters of detail which are noted by the chronicler. All that is left beyond the pale of the "laws of history;" it is consequently not governed by the laws of history. Suppose Columbus had died in childhood; America might have been discovered fifty years later. Suppose the Philippine revolt against Spain had not coincided with the uprising in Cuba; Admiral Dewey would in that case not have gone to Manila; American expansion would have halted at Porto Rico, and might now have a long wait for an opportunity to "plant the American flag" in the Philippines. And who knows but the morsel might in such an event not have escaped "us" altogether.

No one who is not a believer in supernatural determination will maintain that it was "historically necessary" for the uprising in the Philippines to have broken out about the time of the Spanish-American war, or that "historical necessity" saved Columbus from shipwreck on his way to America. Such occurrences are mere accidents, of which Philosophy of History takes no cognizance, but History as a chronicle is all made up of such accidents.

"Looking backward," in the year 2000, upon our present struggles, Dr. Leetc will confine himself to a dispassionate review of the general tendencies of the process of development from capitalism to socialism, but we in the year 1901, standing near the starting point of that century race, will find in the "laws of history" no weather forecast for every day, because those laws, like any scientific abstraction, do not deal with concrete events. Yet we do not live in abstraction, the laws of social development can unfold themselves to us in no other way than through the accidents of our individual or collective careers. We cannot make or unmake sociological laws, but as each individual is shaping himself the actual events of his own biography, so do we all collectively "make history," the composite biography of mankind.

The "laws of history" are silent on the question whether the main branches of industry will come under public control within twenty-five, or fifty, or a hundred years; a difference of twenty-five or fifty years is a mere accident. Still the life of the present generation is all bound up within that accident. By a conscious application of the ascertained "laws of history" we may smooth and shorten that accident, or, to use a classical phrase of Marx, we may "shorten the birthpangs of an old society pregnant with a new one." On the contrary, ignorance of the "laws of history" may lead to acts which must fail of their effect for lack of suitable environment, yet may more or less effectively "clog the wheels of history" for a generation, with all the sufferings and waste of energy involved in the delay. Still these insignificant oscillations of time are not registered on the great observatory clock of Philos-

ophy of History, where "a thousand years is like one minute." ("Poems in Prose," by Tourgneneff.)

The term "laws of history" has been retained in the preceding pages solely because it is accepted in current Socialist discussion. But it is tainted with the ambiguity of the word "History," and should be discarded. From the foregoing remarks it is apparent that there are no laws of history in the ordinary sense of the word, the so-called "laws of history" being meant for sociological laws. The inevitable confusion resulting from the use of ambiguous terms is responsible for the misconception of "historical fatalism," which originates from unconscious substitution of the popular meaning of "history," as a chronicle, for the conception of "philosophy of history."

If the distinction between Sociology and History is clearly kept in mind, the main objection to materialistic philosophy, as applied to social evolution, falls to the ground.

Marxist.

Labor, Capital and China.



T the present time, perhaps no other topic is of more immediate interest to the American laborer or to the American capitalist than that presented by China and the Chinaman.

The American laborer sees in the Chinaman a deadly competitor—a man who, like himself, has for sale labor-power and in almost inexhaustible quantity and at prices with which the American cannot compete and live. This is not a theory. It has passed the experimental stage and been demonstrated on our own soil. About the only interest the average laborer takes in China is based upon the fact that China is the country that furnishes—or could easily furnish—an innumerable horde of these dread competitors. He imagines that if these Chinese can only be kept in their own country, the American labor market will remain in immunity from their poisonous touch.

While the American laborer is certainly to be applauded in his efforts to exclude the Chinese from this country; while all admit that he could not do otherwise, under the existing conditions, than demand his exclusion, without violation of the first law of nature; if he will but glance into the history of the last few years, even superficially, he may learn that the Chinaman, even in China, is rapidly becoming as deadly a foe as the one that bids against him directly in his own market. To develop this thought more clearly we must view this great people from the standpoint of the capitalist.

The capitalist's interest in the Chinese people is identical with his interest in every other people of the earth—he is interested in them as a market for his surplus goods (goods that American labor has produced but cannot buy)—and he is interested in their country as an opening for the investment of his net gains. In these two things, with him all interest begins and ends—a business proposition.

If we are to believe Hon. Chauncey M. Depew and others of equally good authority, American labor produces annually about two billion dollars' worth more goods than American wages can pay for—"than America can consume." These goods must be sold in a foreign market or "stagnation and poverty" must be the reward of the producer. (See Depew's speech in nominating Mr. McKinley at St. Louis.) As this is also the condition that obtains in England, France, Germany and such countries, the reason for the contention over foreign markets is obvious; and

the Pacific islands and the awakening Orient furnish enviable fields for operation.

But the vast empire of China, with its four hundred and fifty millions of industrious, ingenious and, in their way, intelligent people, lacking in so many things that we consider essential to humanity's well being, naturally becomes the great battle-ground of those who have much to sell and millions to invest.

Capital seeks not only to sell goods in China, but to build railroads, establish telegraph and telephone lines, build factories and supply all manner of machinery in whose manufacture America, England and Germany so excell. And why not? Once the "proper spirit" is there awakened, the rest of the combined world cannot present such an opening.

Now, the Chinese are a "peculiar" people—almost as much so in many respects as are we Americans. They do not want our machinery. They battle against its introduction, just as the English weavers fought the introduction of the Arkwright loom; just as the Boston tailors fought the use of the Howe sewing machine; just as the farm laborers of the East opposed the use of McCormick's reaper; just as the grain shovelers fought and struck when the machine shovel took their places; just as the California printers and politicians said "no" when an attempt was made by the Legislature to put linotypes into the State Printing Office—and for the same reasons.

There are probably ten millions of laborers in China whose sole occupation—whose sole means of gaining their daily rice—is transporting burdens (and passengers) over that empire. "What," they ask, "will railroads do for ninety per cent of us?" There are millions more who have been trained from youth for the carrying of messages over China. What will telegraphy and the telephone do for their business? A thousand Chinamen sit carving out pieces of work by hand. Uncle Sam and John Bull come along and suggest that they can furnish a machine that will do more of that work, under one man's hand, than the whole thousand. "Let us alone," they answer, "we are making a living. We do not need your machine. It might make one of us, but more likely an American, a millionaire; but it would send nine hundred and ninety-nine to compete with laborers in some other field. Your machine may be a great labor saving device, but we also realize that it is a labor displacer and a labor competitor. It might make a few millionaires; but it would make just as many million paupers. We don't want it."

The Chinese Minister to England told us about a year ago that while the wolf was suckling Romulus and Remus, China tried machinery. They were forced to abandon it for the reason that it would destroy their country by amassing its wealth into

the hands of the owner, while it of necessity impoverished the masses. But even the shrewd minister did not seem to discern that it was not the machine that wrought the mischief, but its ownership and the power thereby vested to amass the empire into a few hands. He did not discern that while the increased power to produce with little labor was used only to fill the coffers of the few who owned the machinery, the consequences he enumerates must needs follow; but that if the machine had been used as a real labor-saving device and had been made to do the labor of the empire for the good of every being in it, the result would have been very different. He discerned that machines are channels through which wealth flows; but he did not discern that his people were cursed solely because these streams all emptied into the laps of the few owners—that countless billions more of wealth would have been produced and billions of years of labor actually saved his people by retaining the machine, but changing the ownership; by doing away with the capitalistic (parasitic) owner and putting the machine in charge of the people's business manager. In other words, he failed even to think what the socialist demands. And so did the smashers of the looms and sewing machines and reapers; and so do the men who fight the introduction of the machine-shovel, the department store and the trust.

But to return to our own Chinaman and his relation to the American laborer. In spite of all his arguments and use of force to exclude the machine, machinery is going into China, even though it go as opium went there—at the mouth of a foreign cannon. The die is cast; a market and the investment of capital demand it and the demand is imperative.

Now, a Chinaman has in his make up several characteristics that are very marked and among these are industry, ingenuity and the power to imitate. He cannot now invent, but he can construct anything that he ever gets his eye on and use it when constructed. His industry is proverbial, his ingenuity is unsurpassed by that of any other people and he is perhaps the cheapest liver on earth for the amount of work done. And China has seventy millions of such fellows to our ten millions.

Another characteristic that we should note carefully is, that he will not buy anything that he can make and, as before stated, he can make anything he has had fair opportunity to investigate.

We may laugh at his "pig tail" and almond eyes; we may belittle his paganism and philosophize about his tardy civilization and his unprogressiveness; but for a moment, American laborer, lay aside your levity and seriously, from what you know of the Chinaman, as a worker—as a competitor—consider what will be the effect when fifty millions of those fellows are set to work

with English and American machinery. His country is as varied in climate and as rich in resources as any other on earth; he can operate any machine that you can operate, can make anything that you can make; and he can work twelve hours per day and live on ten cents while he is doing it.

That is why you do not want him here. It is also why the capitalist does want him.

The fact that he is a wretched buyer even with his destructive wages and consequently a curtailer of the capitalist's own market, does not appeal to the capitalist with any perceptible force. To produce cheaply is his ambition and he has no time nor disposition to worry over abstractions and learned discussions about the purchasing power of a people—the markets—being dependent upon what is paid labor for producing things. He'll take the cheap labor and leave the market-making to philosophers and philanthropists. He won't raise wages in order that labor may buy more of some other fellow's goods.

But, Mr. Laborer, when the capitalist gets his field for investment and his market for machinery and the Chinaman gets the machine, what will become of your labor market? Is it not obvious that he need not come here in order to compete with you? One per cent of the value of his produce will land it on our shores; hence, so far as results are concerned, ten thousand miles of water affords no safeguard and he might as well be with us. This is the competition that you must soon face—just as England is now facing the competition of America—and, paradoxical as it seems, even the violent support of the Chinaman cannot save you from it. It is in the regular and inevitable line of capitalistic growth.

"But," you answer, "such a course on the part of capitalists can but finally prove self-destructive." True, so of every element in the growth of capitalism. Witness, for instance, the energy displayed in the formation of trusts, though every intelligent and even half-informed person realizes that the formation of a capitalistic trust simply drives another nail in the coffin of capitalism; and he also realizes that their formation can no more be retarded than can the growth of a plant from a seed when every condition is favorable.

Now a word with the Chinaman regarding his opposition to the introduction of machinery. He contends that it would displace millions of laborers, glut his labor market, and flood his country with beggars, tramps, millionaires, trusts, labor unions, labor wars, strikes, lockouts, bank panics, commercial crises, political corruptionists, with power to defy law and courts, and many other "blessings" of which our "civilization" is so productive. Is he right?

Seriously, in view of the conditions that there obtain, if England and America's machinery is to go there and concentrate the producing power, as it must, under the ownership and control of a few; if that machinery is to be used, as it will be, solely as a means for exploiting labor and the consequent amassing of millions—in view of what we know must follow it under the capitalist regime as naturally as doth the night the day, must we not admit that the Chinaman has the better end of the argument?

But if China should say: "Bring on your machinery, but leave your capitalists at home. We will buy it by the millions and make even billions' worth more of it, but no privileged few shall own it. We will not permit it to displace even one of our seventy millions of able-bodied men. It shall be a curse to none, but a blessing to all; for it shall be used only to lighten the burden of toil and shorten the hours of labor. We will use it to make happy homes and free men; not paupers, wage slaves and billionaires. We will organize such trusts as are now the dream of the Occident, but the manager shall be a servant of the many and not of the few. We will demand service or starvation of every able-bodied being and his reward shall be the exact equivalent of what his toil produces." If China should send such a message as that to Europe and America, what would be the capitalist's bid the next day for the markets of China or, for that matter, of any other nation of the earth? What would then become of the Chinese argument against machinery?

And yet the only thing that prevents China's sending such a message to the world is just what prevents America from doing it—lack of recognition of the simple fact that the curses or blessings that are or ought to be traceable to the use of machinery is solely a question of ownership and control—solely a question of whether the machine be used to exploit labor and fill the coffers of the few, or to do the work for the many and benefit only those willing to toil.

N. A. Richardson.

Socialism and Science.



T the very threshold of his efforts the socialist is met by an objection, which, if well founded, certainly renders useless all his agitation and leaves no room for other effort than that of philanthropic amelioration of human suffering. He is told that science itself stands in his way; that the very constitution of nature, as manifested in the law of evolution, balks his efforts; and that it is foolish to contend against the law of the struggle for existence, which is competition, because competition, thus inherent in all nature, is the law of man's social progress, as it is the law of animal development. He is gravely assured that without competition, in fact, there could not be any social adaptation, "and society would lapse into chaos." (Pop. Sci. Mo., June, 1898, p. 269.)

For instance, we are told by Prof. Jordan that we are bound to admit the struggle for existence, but very few realize it. "Men in general are fitted to the struggle as it came to their ancestors, as they are fitted to the pressure of the air. Hence it comes that many writers"—meaning socialists—"have supposed that the struggle for existence belonged to animals only, that man is or should be, exempt from it. Competition has been confounded with injustice, fraud, trickery, and it has been supposed that some act of legislation would put an end to it forever. But competition is inseparable from life. The struggle for existence may be hidden in social conventions, but it can never be extinguished. Nor should it be, for it is the essential force in the progress of life." (Arena, June, 1898, p. 701.)

Such, then, according to Prof. Jordan, is the verdict of Science. We do not realize the struggle—God save the mark!—the hope of the socialist is vain, his efforts useless, his scheme impossible. Science itself stands across his pathway and forbids his advance.

Meantime, while we are assured thus dogmatically that our efforts are a bootless fight against the law of the struggle for existence, or competition, which "may be hidden in conventions, but can never be extinguished," what do these prophets of competition with their fine array of "science" offer us? They all recognize that our social system is full of evil, and that the future of the race is dark. What hope, what consolation do they hold out to the saddened and bruised spirit of man?

They tell us that we can not abolish competition, because it is the natural law of life in all its manifestations. Man can not be improved by changing his conditions, because men evolve the so-

cial conditions they are adapted to, and so every attempted improvement of those conditions would be injurious. Our only hope lies in "a growing moralization of public opinion," as Prof. Youmans calls it (*Pop. Sci. Mo.*, Sept., 1898, p. 705), much more than in the assumption by the people in their governmental adjustments of the means of production and distribution. First make men moral—no, let men grow more moral. Then expect better social arrangements and a better society.

But all improvement, however achieved by this gradual "moralization," depends ultimately on competition. The remedy, indeed, is not the suppression or even curtailment of competition, but more of it and greater freedom for its action. "It is not necessary," says Prof. Youmans, "to deny that competition has been and is attended by many evils; but it will be found on examination that these evils are generally of a character to impair the competition and render it more or less illusory." (*Pop. Sci. Mo.*, June, 1898, p. 269.) And, says Prof. Jordan, "Self-realization in life is only possible where self-perdition is also possible. When cruelty and hate are excluded by force, charity and helpfulness will go with them. Strength and virtue have their roots within man, not without. They may be checked, but they can not be greatly stimulated by institutions and statutes." (*Arena*, June, 1898, p. 762-3.) In other words, these gentlemen assume that present social conditions and phenomena are ultimate facts of nature; that the social laws now apparent to us are immutable laws, which it would be impossible for men to alter, and which it would be extremely dangerous for men to try to control.

Thus I have stated the obstacles set up by the defenders of the present system, their statement of the conditions, and their remedy for the admitted evils. Standing athwart the path of the socialist who thinks that bad social adjustments are the causes of these evils, and who also thinks he knows the remedy in different industrial arrangements, which compose the foundation on which all types of society rest, and which all history shows can be changed and controlled by man, Science, say these professors, can only offer the remedy of "a growing moralization of public opinion!" This is the last word to the fevered soul and throbbing heart of the reformer, the crushing reply to the poverty, suffering and crime of down-trodden men and women at the end of a wonderful century of progress in science, industry and art.

If this reply were valid and this all the remedy, dark indeed would be the future of mankind; dreary indeed the prospect of the race; hard indeed the fate of society. Its history could be written very shortly as a repetition of a rise from the chaos of savagery, progress through barbarism into a semblance of civilization, during which periods the big devour the little, then decay

from dry-rot and final death, to be followed by a similar cycle in some other locality by some other people.

But is the reply valid? Is the remedy any remedy at all? I for one deny both. While all admit the many evils of the present system, to the socialist there can be but one remedy. It is all very well to preach to men to be better, to improve themselves individually; it is all very well to say to them that their only hope for better things lies in the "growing moralization of public opinion." I answer that men can no more become moral or grow in morality with bad social conditions, with the poverty and lack of material comfort due to the fierce competition of the present system of industry, confronted by the ever-recurring sight of unequal opportunities on this earth, where a few enjoy all the bounties of nature at the expense and toil of the millions, confronted, too, on every hand by the unequal distribution of the products of their labor and the consequent "injustice, fraud and trickery" of the daily life of the people, both rich and poor, than you could expect the sun to stand still in Ajalon.

Again, I deny that there is any such "growing moralization of public opinion." On the contrary, there is rather a growing demoralization of public opinion, if the recent antics of millionaires, and their imitators, in their private lives, the governmental corruption at home and abroad, and the recent recrudescence of outrageous warring by the stronger peoples on the weaker, can count as evidence.

No, the true rule is and must be, Bad conditions, bad men. Poverty and want are the parents of crime, and no amount of dogmatic assertion to the contrary by these defenders of existing society can alter the facts, or need dampen the ardor of the socialist. He knows that the whole fabric of modern capitalism, with its socialized methods of production, but competitive methods of distribution, is unjust and oppressive, is responsible for the ominous division of society into the capitalist class on one hand and the wage-slave class on the other, and is only a phase of industrial evolution destined by virtue of its own logic to pass into some other form.

Nevertheless, is it true that the verdict of science is against the socialist? Does science really deprive socialism of its possibility? Does it undermine the foundation on which socialism stands, when it asserts that competition is essential to social growth, its abolition impossible, and even its curtailment hurtful? Must the socialist perforce reckon with it in all his calculations for the social revolution?

I think not. And here let us define our terms. What is competition? Prof. Jordan identifies it with the struggle for existence, and thereby falls into grievous error; for, he goes on to

define this struggle as appearing "under a threefold form; the struggle of creatures with like creatures; the struggle with unlike forms; and the struggle with the conditions of the environment." This is a profound truth, and carries with it many profound implications. Let us examine it.

We all admit the struggle for existence in the slow process of evolution. We must admit also that this struggle manifests itself in the three ways pointed out by Prof. Jordan. This being so, it strikes me that the identification of competition with the struggle for existence is not true. Obviously, it is a straining of words to speak of competing with the "conditions of the environment." Animals and men may and do compete with each other for the use of the environment; it is absurd to say that animals and the environment compete with each other. They struggle with the conditions of the environment, and men and some animals have changed them and can continue to do so.

What would they compete for? The word "competition" means the striving after the same object at the same time together with and against others. What do men and animals compete with each other for? Obviously, for the means of life. Then it is untrue to say that they compete with the environment. Competition predicates life and mind as its conditions; life at least in plants and very low animals; mind in all higher forms of animal life. All animals compete for the use of the environment; the environment can not and does not compete with them for anything. Hence this third form of the struggle for existence is not identical with competition.

The second form of the struggle, that of creatures with unlike forms, while applicable to the lower animals and to plants, if it ever had any application to man as man, has long since ceased to be any factor in man's evolution. Man's prehuman ancestors, no doubt, were subject to this form of the struggle, and thereby became men; but now this form may be classed with the third, as one of the conditions of the environment. Man no longer competes with the lower animals for life, or the means of subsistence; he uses them for his own purposes of pleasure or profit.

But when we come to the first form of this struggle, that of like creatures with like, we at once come to competition pure and simple. Here nature, "red in tooth and claw," employs competition as its main instrument in the transmutation of species. Here, war, deadly strife, merciless brutality and conscienceless destruction, thoughtless waste and natural lawlessness hold high carnival; but out of it all, with the co-operation of the other two forms, arise the countless species of animals and plants on this globe. Man has been no exception; he, too, is the product of the inexorable play of these forces. But once become man by these

means, the process of creation can evidently go no further; for, it has also brought into being the chief and distinguishing mark of humanity—intellect, by means of which man can control his destiny, change his environment, and subject the forces of the world, physical and psychical, to his dominion.

For, we know that since his creation by natural selection, with man competition has taken two forms, that of social group against social group, and that of individual against individual in the same social group. When the first small group of human beings united for self-protection, or co-operated together against a common foe, animal or human, they ceased internal competition among themselves. Competition did not exist industrially in primitive societies. Its absence was an advantage in that it was the best way by which men could satisfy their desires. Hence those groups which were combined into the best and most complete co-operation for their common welfare were the ones that, under the action of natural selection, survived. The greater the co-operation and the less the competition inside the group, the more likely was the group to survive in the struggle for existence with groups with less co-operation and more competition.

It is only in modern times under the rule of capitalism that individual competition has come into play again in human life, and it is under the rule of capitalism that the greatest misery, suffering and crime, the most glaring contrasts of wealth and poverty, are to be seen. We have the spectacle of nations producing untold wealth, but whose members permit the most heartless competition among themselves in the apportionment of what they produce, resulting in a rich capitalist class owning and enjoying the fruits of all the means of production and governing with iron hand under the iron law of wages the immensely greater number of their fellows. Thus modern societies have gone back to the method of the lower animals in seeking the satisfaction of their desires, which method is really desocializing the various social groups. The result is, indeed, a new species of men, the monsters of capitalism, tramps and millionaires on one side, and on the other the stooped and oftentimes broken-spirited wage slave, bearing on his shoulders the whole weight of the social fabric.

If, then, we must define competition as that part of the struggle for existence between like creatures, I am prepared to affirm, so far as man is concerned, that it belongs and ought to belong only to the lower animals and plants, and that man "is or ought to be exempt from it." The socialist is right in saying that competition is identical with "injustice, fraud, trickery," and that certainly it can be checked and curtailed, and ought to be entirely abolished by the united effort of men.

This is so, because from the very beginning of society man has been compelled to check and curtail it, in order to survive in the struggle for existence. In union there is strength, was early discovered to be the law of social development. In fact, society is not natural, in the sense in which we speak of the word nature in the production of species by natural selection, or in the formation of a crystal or a mountain. It is an artificial product of man, a real contrivance for the better satisfaction of man's desires, which are the social forces. In its very essence society is thus seen to be the negation of competition.

For, the first men that co-operated with each other in the effort to overcome any obstacle, whether of enemies or of securing subsistence—and this was in fact the first kind of co-operation—to that extent laid aside their competition with each other. Sooner or later the advantages of co-operation, and hence of society, were felt by primitive men, and also the evils of competition were early seen. The curtailment of competition even among lower animals was the beginning of society in some sort; its suppression will be the completion of human society.

But Prof. Jordan does not believe all this; he is so in love with competition that he says, "We must remember that the struggle for existence in human society does not mean brutality!" He means, of course, that competition does not mean brutality. In this he is manifestly wrong. What could be more brutal than the manifestations of the competitive spirit in modern industry? He knows, and everybody knows, that competition under present social arrangements, if it means anything, is nothing but war to the knife among individuals, and as it ramifies modern society it carries with itself all the qualities of merciless brutality, though it may seem to be "hidden in social conventions." Obviously, too, as such it acts as a check to the growth of the altruistic sentiments, which are, he says, "the expression of the strength of mutual respect and mutual forbearance." But under the competitive system these sentiments are measured by the knowledge that the other fellow may be the strongest and hence may get the advantage! For competition is the synonym for selfishness, altruism, for sociality.

This being so, we may define socialism in one of its aspects as that type of society which checks and restrains competition within such limits as practically to abolish it, and which industrially makes combination and co-operation the basis of social development. So that the fallacy in the argument of these gentlemen, who try so hard to put a scientific obstacle in the way of the socialist, lies partly in the fact that they confuse the struggle for existence with competition, and partly in the assumption that the same laws obtain in social as in animal evolution. They forget

that in social evolution we have to reckon with new factors, with new elements and forces—the varied and ever-expanding desires of men. While man is no doubt a growth from lower animal forms, still he is man, a creature with almost totally different attributes, needs and desires.

We have plant life, with its laws; animal life, with its laws; the psychic life, with its laws; the social life, with its laws; all different realms, where different forces act and react, and which are subject to different laws. The law of the struggle for existence has now to deal with an active factor in the world, that of mind, and hence manifests itself now in the natural selection of choices of conscious human beings, all prompted and moved to act by their desires. Competition is and was the rule of conduct in the lowest forms of plant and animal life; it decreases somewhat in intensity in higher forms among which rudimentary societies are formed; while among men the formation and growth of society is its negation. In man the restraint of competition is parallel with the advancement of man from savagery to civilization.

And now man stands on the threshold of a new life, reaching out to a greater socialization of his activities and to a better realization of those spiritual principles that are striving to become the leading forces of his further progress, but which can not come into full play as long as competition is permitted to hold the field and to determine his destiny.

The socialist, therefore, need not feel discouraged by the attitude of science. Science does not stand in his way, but rather urges him forward, and is his chief beacon light, showing him the way to direct his efforts. Instead of blocking his path, science teaches him that competition belongs to brutes, not to men, and that it is to-day the greatest obstacle to the completer social adjustments. Science shows every day that the greed and strife of the present system are devouring men, and that if they would grow to better adjustments, if men would "rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things," they must still further cast out this destructive poison of competition from their midst, and adopt that complete democracy embodied in socialism. Science shows us that, if men will leave aside the suicidal policy of the present industrial system, they will find ample scope for all their varied activities in the struggle to master the natural environment in which they live, by subduing it to their various uses. In this active field of endeavor man will find all the incentives of a social being to higher life and greater achievement.

Here let me quote the testimony of Maj. J. W. Powell, who has expressed a somewhat similar thought to mine in the February Forum, 1891, which has fallen into my hands since writing

the above. After showing that there are four modes of life, which he terms "vitality, sentiency, percipiency and voliciency," he says: "These powers come in the order in which they have been named, and constitute a series of transformations. . . . In the four modes of life there are four lines of evolution or becoming, but they are not parallel. From the midst of plant life springs animal life; from the midst of animal life springs psychic life; and from the midst of psychic life springs social life; and each presents a distinct series of becoming, governed by its own laws of evolution. As there are four kinds of life, so there are four kinds of evolution, four systems of laws; that is, there are four groups of phenomena and four methods of genesis. But in the complexities of the cosmos the phenomena are entangled; and in the doctrines of evolution taught by scientific men, and reiterated in the literature of the times, the four methods of becoming have been still further entangled and confused. Thus the laws of evolution applying to plants and to animals have been supposed to be identical with the laws of evolution of men in society, making the doctrines of evolution opposed to the plans of men in their endeavor to improve their condition. The survival of the fittest is supposed to be a more potent process than the endeavor for improvement, and mercy and charity are supposed to thwart the laws of universal progress."

Thus does this great scientist explode the flimsy arguments of Professors Jordan and Youmans and other defenders of present iniquity, with its doctrines of laissez-faire, "growing moralization," and the overpowering importance of competition, "without which society would lapse into chaos." The argument shows beyond doubt that science, instead of being opposed to socialism, or that socialism is contrary to the laws of evolution, really predicates that socialism is the only scientific form of society. The law of the survival of the fittest is not more "potent than the endeavor for improvement;" social man ought not only to be exempt from competition, but naturally is exempt; and it is just the existence of competition in modern society that is the cause of the present hindrance to higher social progress.

For we must not forget that socialism is a form of government, having its authority from within; that is, it must be genuinely democratic, a government of the people's affairs by the people for their own benefit—the merging of politics into industrial management. Growing moralization is a good thing, mutual respect and forbearance are good things; but they can never be more than skin deep under a system, where in spite of all that may be said men are really enemies to each other and know it. For unless you give men a better material basis on which to live, unless you make conditions under which the incentive to greed is

removed with the possibility of profit, all your efforts to smother them in moral platitudes and fine phrases about opposing the very laws of nature will be in vain. To improve we must obey the law of social growth, which we are gradually learning is co-operation, since society is nothing else than the combined co-operative actions of men for attaining their happiness. We must leave the laws of animal life behind us, search out the laws of social development and the underlying forces, take these forces, control them and use them for the common purpose of individual happiness, as we are abundantly able to do, if we choose.

J. W. Summers.

Asheville, N. C.

EDITORIAL

Recent Developments in Opportunism.

Recent events in some European countries are extremely interesting in view of the efforts of a few Socialists in this country to deflect the movement in the direction of "opportunism." During the "prosperous" times which prevailed in Europe a few years ago it was possible for the employing class to grant small concessions to the workers. Such concessions were less harmful than any cessation of industry and stoppage of profits. But during the last year has come the "American invasion," and business depression, industrial bankruptcies, unemployed armies and hunger riots followed one another in swift and terrible succession. When this time came the day of compromise was past. Employers could not grant favors that would destroy their small remnants of profits, even though the alternative was the destruction of the whole profit system. Such a concession meant their individual disappearance from the ranks of profit receivers and the capitalist has not yet risen to that lofty stage of class-consciousness where he is willing to sacrifice his individual chance to secure profits for the sake of any social system.

Because of these and other recent developments there have been some interesting occurrences in European Socialist circles. In France the Millerand movement seems to have well nigh reached its end. Steadily the ministerialist supporters have fallen away. Attempting to trim their sails to the varying winds of disintegrating bourgeois interests, they have gradually drifted away from all genuine proletarian class interests. Once the field of bourgeois politics was entered, all the influences of capitalist environment tended to mould them to its image. They became ever less and less revolutionary.

When a few weeks ago the Ministerialist convention was held at Tours the attendance was so pitifully small that the management refused to give out the list of delegates. At the same time so far had they departed from the position of international Socialism that the Berlin Vorwaerts described the result of their deliberations as an "organization for disorganization and the furtherance of opportunism." Existing alliances with capitalist parties were reported and plans laid for new bargains of the same kind. Yet with the contradictory character that is ever the accompaniment of opportunism they adopted a platform filled with the phrases of the revolutionary Socialism which their every action had repudiated and then "most unkindest cut of all"

unanimously resolved that "no Socialist may enter a ministry without the consent of the party."

"Le Mouvement Socialiste," long considered as at least sympathetic with the ministerialist policy and Jaures, but which now is clearly with the revolutionary forces, says in a late issue of the "Union," engineered by Jaures in 1899, and of which so much was expected at the time: "One by one all the revolutionary forces there artificially assembled have disintegrated, and the process still continues. In 1900, at the convention in the Hall Wagram at Paris, the Parti Ouvrier Francais (Guesdists) were the first to break away and make union impossible. * * * At Lyons in 1901 the Parti Socialiste Revolutionaire in its turn severed all connection between its organization and the elements which appeared so chaotic and uncertain. Some months later the Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Revolutionaire in its turn declared its independence, and to-day the best of the independent federations have broken from a party which now retains nothing Socialist save the name."

So fatal has been the disorganizing influence of the bourgeois tendencies, that have been admitted under the name of opportunism, upon the unification of the French Socialist movement that to-day, in the face of a general election, it is Jaures, who is without doubt one of the most brilliant figures in the French Socialist movement if not in the whole international movement—Jaures, who a few short months ago was looked upon as the one man who more than any other single individual was bringing closer the day of a united Socialist movement in France, is to-day declared by Karl Kautsky to be the greatest obstacle in the way of securing that unity. "Perhaps the coming election," says Kautsky in a late issue of the *Neue Zeit*, "may serve to soften these personal antipathies and prepare the way for union. A battle against a common foe often does wonders in this direction. But this result can only be secured when the main obstacle now standing between the two fractions is removed, and that obstacle is—Jaures. * * * The unity of the French Socialists can only be secured against, not with Jaures." "Le Mouvement Socialiste" makes this significant comment upon Kautsky's words: "We do not think it is necessary to struggle simply against one single person. * * * We prefer rather to declare war on tendencies and systems,—to state Socialism we would oppose revolutionary Socialism." Let the comrades in America ponder well these words. Can we not learn from the experience of the French comrades or must we have a term at the same terribly costly school.

Turn now to England, the classic land of Fabianism, compromise and opportunism and the events of the last few months are teaching the same lesson. About three years ago an effort was made to unite the Independent Labor Party, the Social Democratic Federation, the Fabians and some of the trade unions upon a Socialistic basis in the hope of securing a "labor group" of members in Parliament. The S. D. F., with some of the trade unions, desired that a Socialist resolution, affirming the class war and the fundamentals of international Socialism, be made the basis of union. This position was opposed by the Fabians and the I. L. P. with the usual arguments of opportunism. Unfortunately the latter forces were the stronger. Steadily since then the Labor Representation Committee has grown further and further from Socialism. This

opinion of ours is based, not alone on the statements of the S. D. F., who withdrew when bourgeois tendencies seemed to dominate, but on the printed reports of the succeeding conferences and the comments of the capitalist press and the discussions that have arisen within the I. L. P. At the last meeting of the Labor Representation Conference there were not lacking defenders of the group of notoriously anti-Socialistic "labor members" now in the House of Commons, and it was evident that to-day there would be no hope of carrying the Socialist resolution, whose passage would have been an easy matter at the first meeting had the avowed Socialists stood by their colors.

Meanwhile there seems to be some signs of disintegration within the I. L. P. itself, which has always been opportunistic in its tactics. Many branches grew rebellious at the action of the I. L. P. officials in actively opposing Comrade Quelch, when he made his recent gallant fight for Socialism at Dewsbury. Finally, to make the parallel with France even closer, Robert Blatchford, who has always been considered more or less opportunistic in his attitude, comes out clearly for the class-struggle position, throws his influence on the side of the S. D. F. and declares Keir Hardie to be the greatest obstacle to Socialist unity in England.

Recent events in Italy have been teaching the same lessons with even greater clearness and additional emphasis. The Zanardelli ministry came into power with the votes of the Socialists because it was fighting the reactionary effort being made by the conservative forces to deprive the laborers of the right of organization. Under these conditions many Socialists, including the brilliant Turati, were in favor of considering the Socialists as pledged to the support of the ministry. But Enrico Ferri, and those who with him stood upon a revolutionary position, declared that while they had accepted the formation of this ministry as the alternative to a period of persecution of organized labor, they would not be bound by any policy as a ministerialist party, but would hold themselves as ever antagonistic to any and all capitalist governments. For a time it looked as if opportunism, here as elsewhere, would become a disrupting force and split the hitherto solid ranks of the Italian proletariat. Opportunism seemed for the moment to be gaining ground. At once the logical result followed. The bourgeois, no longer frightened by the advance of a solid proletarian movement, saw no necessity in granting even momentary palliatives, but, on the contrary, redoubled their attempts to crush the laborers. The government replaced strikers by soldiers, threatened to force the railroad employes into military service if they dared to strike, absolutely forbid any organization of the employes of the postoffice and telegraphs, and prepared a series of laws for the regulation and annoyance of all bodies of laborers. Under these conditions it is no wonder that it was not long until Comrade Schiavi, the well-known correspondent of the International Socialist Review, was able to write in "Le Mouvement Socialiste": "Our foreign comrades may be reassured: the harmony between the Socialists and the Ministry is ended, and the Socialist group in Parliament no longer soils its conscience with votes of confidence in a bourgeois Ministry."

But the king has refused to accept the resignations of this ministry and has sent them back into power. As to the further occurrences we cannot speak with so much accuracy, as we are still dependent on the

reports of the capitalist press (not having yet received any direct word through Socialist sources), but according to these reports the king has declared himself a "Socialist." What he means by this is shown by his extended instructions to his cabinet. He outlines a plan of nationalization and municipalization that for elaborateness of detail and inclusiveness is more extensive than any list of "immediate demands" ever yet outlined by any American, French, German or English opportunist. We may be sure that this program will be carried into effect with a rapidity exactly proportionate to the growth of an uncompromising, class-conscious revolutionary Socialist Party in Italy, and let those who sneer at these phrases mark that fact.

There is scarcely a theoretical argument in support of opportunism that is not answered by the experience of these three countries during the last few years. All that the opponents of opportunism have ever said as to its disintegrating tendencies and corrupting influence is justified in France and England, while Italy confirms once more what Germany proved under Bismarck, that the most effective way for Socialists to advance reforms is to neither beg nor demand them of capitalism, but to threaten the whole structure of plutocracy and exploitation, when those who are in control of governmental machinery at present, and who therefore alone can enact reforms, will hasten to throw these sops to their opponents in the hope of retaining the possibility of continuous, even though diminished exploitation.

BOOK REVIEWS

Captain Jinks, Hero. By Ernest Crosby. Funk & Wagnalls Co. Cloth, 393 pp. \$1.50.

Ernest Crosby is already known to the readers of this Review for his charming Whitman-like poetry. Those who have known only this side of him will be scarcely prepared for the merciless satire and brilliant shafts of cutting wit with which "Captain Jinks, Hero" abounds. A little boy, born upon a farm, loving the animals he sees about him, with no thought of war or military things, is, by the present of a box of lead soldiers, with their beplumed and painted general, made a great admirer of military ideals. He visits a neighboring town and sees a "boy-brigade" and never rests until he becomes a member and can march proudly along with "miniature muskets and fixed bayonets" singing:

"Onward, Christian soldiers,

'Gainst the heathen crew!

In the name of Jesus.

Let us run them through.

Having an uncle with "political influence," he is sent to "East Point." Here his desire to be a "hero" and his worship of anything that "had always been done" makes him enjoy hazing and preserve as his most precious keepsake, next to his old leaden hero, a snapshot taken of himself with his head in a tub of water,—the same tub that "General Meriden" was ducked in. Flirting and the regular routine of "East Point" life are satirized with a power of vivid representation that makes you almost feel as if this laughable farce were actual history, from which it really differs far less than much of the stuff that now bears the name. The "Castalian War" breaks out and Captain Jinks, together with his college chum, a most matter-of-fact individual named Cleary, who makes an excellent Sancho Panza to this modern Don Quixote, go to the front. Political influence again secures the "hero" a position, and Cleary, the reporter for the "Metropolitan Daily Lyre," agrees to see to it that he comes home a real hero if ink can be of any service in that respect. All the main actors in the Spanish-American war, as well as in the Chinese campaign, come on to the stage in thinly veiled disguise, and the principal events of that war are told from a different point of view than the "hero making" yellow journals have hitherto chronicled them. Captain Jinks and Cleary are captured by a savage tribe inhabiting the interior of the "Cubapibes" and are about to be executed when the chief declares that his tribe is part of a great brotherhood extending all over the world.

"There are four marks of the true Morito," said the chief. "Their young men are initiated by torture. That is one mark. Then their chief

men wear feathers on their heads. That is the second. And the third mark is that they are tattooed as I am,' and he pointed to the strange figures on his naked chest; 'and the fourth is that they all use the sacred tomtom when they dance.' "

Cleary at once declares to the chief of the savages: "We are your brothers. We are Moritos. We are people from a distant island and you never knew it." The chief shows some doubts at first, but a display of the photographs of the hazing and of an "East Point" dress parade settles the "initiation by torture" and the "head-feathers" business, while the prominent base-drum proved the possession of the tomtom, and Captain Jinks being quite elaborately tattooed, the chief is convinced and, rubbing his nose rapturously against that of Captain Jinks, he cries out:

"Oh, my brothers! To think that I should not have known you. You torture each other just as we do. You are tattooed just as we are! You have bigger feathers and bigger dances and bigger tomtoms. You are bigger savages than we are! Come, let us feast together."

At last, when Captain Jinks has risen by virtue of some lucky accident, political influence, skillful advertising and the friendship of the "Benevolent Assimilation Company, Limited," becomes a "hero," he returns to his native country, is kissed by crowds of young women, dares to try to stop the kissing and at once becomes the most insignificant of men. All this time he has been worried about something. Ever since he met the great German war lord in "Porsselania" he has been trying to imagine if he could really rise to the true ideal of a soldier, as set out by this greatest of heroes, and shoot down his dearest friend or relative without a tremor, if ordered to do so by a superior officer. He finds that in spite of himself he will have qualms when he comes to consider the girl whom he is about to marry. This so preys upon him that his mind gives way, and when Cleary visits him in the asylum he is playing with his old lead soldiers of his boyhood and tells his former chum in a confidential way: "They say I'm a lunatic, but I'm not. When they say I'm a lunatic they mean I'm a perfect soldier—a complete soldier. And they call those fine fellows lead soldiers! Lunatics and lead soldiers, indeed! Well, suppose we are! I tell you an army of lead soldiers, with a lunatic at the head, would be the best army in the world. We do what we're told, and we're not afraid of anything."

If this book could be put in the hands of every boy of fifteen it would make an end of the business of the recruiting sergeant before another generation passed away. It is so interesting that any boy (or man, or woman, either) who once started to read it would never lay it down, and if he did not see the lesson at once it would strike in before he was old enough to enlist, and he would see the cold, cruel, commercial character of modern warfare as well as the idiocy of its tinsel glitter.

Orloff and His Wife. Maxim Gorky. Scribner's. Cloth, 485 pp. \$1.00.

There are eight stories of varying length in this book, and each of them shows some new phase of this wonderful Russian analyst of human and social psychology. "Orloff and His Wife" is a study in the direct influence of environment, showing how human nature is debased, elevated and eternally impressed by its surroundings. "Konovaloff" and "Men with Pasts" are studies of the "under-world" of tramps and out-

casts. There have been numerous writers about this social class before, but if you want to know just how little the Wycoffs, Riis, McCooks, Josiah Flynts, etc., knew about the actual inner life and thoughts of this world, read Gorky, who simply lets the people of this class speak through him to the reader. "Varenka Oleroff" is a study of the contrast presented by a natural, open-minded woman who has grown up apart from the rules of modern society and a man who is the embodiment of conventional ideals. The theme is old as fiction, but the treatment is original with Gorky. He treats it with an abandon, a naturalism, a realism, if you wish, that is startling in its situations and thrilling in its denouement.

Socialist literature is now being produced at such a rate that it is impossible to do more than notice the numerous pamphlets that appear each month, and give now and then a word of a new publication. Among the latest Socialist periodicals that have entered the arena is to be mentioned the revival by Comrade Fred Warren of the old "Coming Nation," the appearance at Los Angeles of the "Social Crusader" under the editorship of Comrade J. Stitt Wilson, and the first issue of what at least claims to be a Socialist monthly called "The Multitude," under the editorship of Walter Vrooman, who at least produces a lively, readable article, whatever we may think of his political tactics. In pamphlet literature, first place must be given to Comrade Hanford's "Railroading in the United States," which is addressed "To the Not Yet Dead," and will certainly serve to rouse many a worker on American railroads to a sense of his conditions and possibilities. This pamphlet and another, entitled "The Clerical Capitalist," by Father McGrady, are published at five cents each by the Socialistic Co-operative Publishing Association of New York. The Standard Publishing Company, of Terre Haute, Ind., send out another excellent little propaganda pamphlet, at the same price, by Charles C. Hitchcock, entitled "Sanctions for Socialism," which is one of the kind that can never be too numerous because they are always just what you want to hand to "the man on the street" to make a Socialist of him. Charles H. Kerr and Company have issued another number of the "Pocket Library," this time by Comrade Franklin Wentworth, entitled "The Pride of Intellect." "What Is a Scab?" by A. M. Simons, issued by this same company, is an example of a cheaper class of leaflet, such as is much needed and which sells at fifteen cents a dozen or a dollar a hundred. The Socialistic Co-operative Association republishes Comrade Wilshire's "Why Workmen Should Be Socialists" at a similar low price. Peter Peterson publishes himself a pamphlet entitled "Privileged Anarchy and Lawless Anarchy with a Remedy for Both," which is supposed to advocate Socialism as the "remedy," but which would have been much more valuable had the writer been a little more familiar with the literature of Socialism. Still another, which comes in a most attractive form, just as we go to press, is Comrade John Spargo's "Where We Stand," which is issued by "The Comrade" at five cents. It also is one of the best of this class of pamphlets, of which one can never have too many, whose aim and object is to "make Socialists," and we feel sure this will attain its end.

The New Century Song Book. By B. M. Lawrence, M. D., Los Angeles. J. F. Marek, Publisher.

Here is a book planned with the most laudable intention to do good. If genuine enthusiasm would enable a man to make a book of Socialist songs without understanding either prosody or Socialism, we should be enabled to commend the book to our readers.

It contains the music and original words of many familiar songs, and on the opposite pages new words by the author, "written with a heart full of hope for the final victory of right over wrong." The following extract speaks for itself:

"Fair morning comes! Behold the dawn of direct legislation;
The day of greed will soon be gone, along with competition.
Great wrongs abound, we all must own, but, voters, we can end them;
By Switzerland the way is shown—they call it referendum.

Chorus:

Oh! think, comrades, by votes the nation can
And soon it must own every trust, by the Referendum Plan.

Another song is in memoriam of "our martyred President," McKinley (page 19); another deplores the crime of '73 (page 29); on the next page is one beginning, "Oh, Greenback, with thee, best money of the free, our praise we bring."

Interspersed between the songs are prose sentences on Socialism, some of them very good, indeed, but edited without discrimination and lapsing every little while into "postoffice Socialism." The book closes with some original verses suitable for recitations, which are very much better than the author's songs. There are ninety-four pages, and the book might be greatly improved by omitting perhaps sixty-four of them.

Among the Periodicals.

From the article in "Country Life" on "The Animals of the Farm," we learn that "when put to work for which it is suited, even a moderately light farm horse is equal to ten men. The labor per day of a man costs twice as much as that of a horse. The American farmer has become skillful enough to substitute horse-hoe tillage for hand tillage. If he hooks two horses together he increases his efficiency more than twenty times. The great prairies are now plowed largely with a team of five horses. One man becomes equal to fifty. Thirty or more horses are hooked to a harvesting machine; four men are required to operate it, and their efficiency in gathering the harvest is multiplied five hundred to a thousand fold." One can but wonder why it is that the farmer, who has such a regiment of brute slaves to increase his productive power, must live so poorly. Two almost disappearing industries are described in the articles on "The Sugar Bush" and the "Life of the Trapper."

Among the many valuable publications which are distributed gratuitously by the United States government is the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance. This is a periodical of about five hundred large folio, double-column pages, and is sent free to all who apply to the Treasury Department for it. Each number contains one or more valuable monographs, besides a summary of all the statistical facts that have

been gathered by the various government bureaus during the previous month. The January number, which has just come to hand, is mainly occupied with a discussion of "The World's Sugar Production and Consumption, 1800-1900," which is an extensive compilation of facts concerning the sugar industry in all parts of the world. Another monograph gives a full description, geographical, historical, economic and social of the Danish West Indies, and a condensed statistical summary of "The Progress of the United States in Its Material Industries" during the last century. But perhaps the most interesting portion of the whole publication is to be found in the portion which is devoted each month to a study of price changes. A table is here given of the increase in prices proportionate to consumption. "Quotations of all the necessities of life are taken, including whisky and tobacco, and in each case the price is multiplied by the annual per capita consumption, which precludes any one commodity having more than its proper weight in the aggregate." By this method it is shown that the cost of living, which was represented January 1, 1897, by the index number 75.09, had risen by January 1, 1902, to 101.587. That is, the "cost of living" had risen over 34 per cent. Unless money wages have risen an equal amount, there has been the largest cut in wages ever known in this country. But this is only a small portion of the story told by these figures, although it is all that has been seen by the average reader of them heretofore. The table given is divided according to products, and if we take only those tables including the staple foods which make up the fare of the workers, we find that there has been an increase of prices and consequent diminution of wages since January, 1897, of over 48 per cent. Even then we have not yet reached the whole truth. These figures are wholesale prices, and when a retailer handles goods he figures his profits at so much per cent on his original cost, and the larger the wholesale price the greater the absolute profit per article. Hence retail prices always fluctuate much more than wholesale. Taking all these facts into consideration (and none of these facts were gathered by Socialists), it is a conservative statement to say that wages have been reduced by the rise in the cost of living nearly 60 per cent during the past four years. Who is getting the benefits of prosperity?

The principal article in the March *Craftsman* is "The Gothic Revival," which gives a popular yet fairly exhaustive and interesting discussion of the most beautifully creative period of the human race. "The epoch being so strongly organic, its art, or spiritual expression, was necessarily structural. The uniform creed, single social scheme, common system of education, and one accepted type of beauty demanded a realization of the ideal which should epitomize and incarnate the poetic, artistic and devotional spirit of the age. This realization was attained in the Gothic cathedral, which embodies more perfectly and defines more clearly than any other medium 'the sentiment of the infinite,' which, in the judgment of Michelet, was the 'greatest gift of the Middle Ages to humanity.'" There is also an article by A. M. Simons on "The Economic Foundation of Art," pointing out that the only place where all who are seeking to secure better and more artistic conditions of production can effectively co-operate for a common end is in the political Socialist movement.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

France.

Opportunism in France, after running amuck for three years, is now coming to a parting of the way. One federation after another leaves the Millérand-Jaurès combination and either joins the revolutionary Socialists at once or sits temporarily on the fence to save appearances. Millérand still continues to proclaim that he has "remained true to his principles" and that he "obeys the resolutions of his party." He is not in the least disturbed by the fact that his presence in the cabinet is a violation of the Kautsky resolution adopted at the last international congress and of all national party resolutions. Socialism is still his goal, but it all depends on his definition of Socialism.

"It is hard to define what Millérand calls Socialism," writes Jean Longuet in the "Neue Zeit." "Five years ago, at the banquet of St. Mandé, his conception already seemed very much different from that of the Socialists of all other countries. Since then the few points of agreement between him and international Socialism have entirely disappeared. Even the most moderate of our 'possibilists' (opportunists), or of the German 'Bernsteinians' never reduced the Socialist conception of the class struggle and of the proletarian revolution down to the idea of 'social peace.' * * * We believe that those whose views agree better with bourgeois democracy than with revolutionary proletarianism would do better to form the left wing of the great Waldeck-Rousseau reform party. Those, however, who wish to continue their specifically proletarian activity on the basis of the class struggle should find a place in a united Socialist party—no matter how moderate they may be. * * * Never was the situation more favorable to the French Socialist party. The most extreme anarchy is reigning in production. The overproduction in the grain and wine industry, the 110,000,000 francs of bounty which the taxpayers have unwittingly given to the great sugar refineries, the decay of nationalism, all this would furnish excellent propaganda material for our party. But in order to use this material the party must again become what it was three years ago: the militant party whose victorious development nothing could stop, until the disastrous policy of opportunism and the renunciation of the fundamental principles of our fight almost caused our downfall."

Kautsky adds the following comment: "The coming election campaign may serve in a measure to smooth over the personal differences and thus open the way for a union of forces. A fight against the common

enemy does sometimes wonders in this respect. But this effect cannot be produced, until the main obstacle that stands between the two elements has fallen—Jaurès.

Longuet has shown how much damage Millérand is doing, how his presence in the cabinet disrupts the party—he might even have said corrupts the party. He has shown that Millérand is not a proletarian, but a bourgeois Socialist who has no business in the Socialist party. But Jaurès upholds him, Jaurès gives him strength and backing. He is the standard bearer of the Millérand system, or, rather, he is the man who transformed the foolhardy experiment of an ambitious selfseeker into a system for the emancipation of the proletariat. It is Jaurès who has brought all the present troubles on the French Socialist party. It is Jaurès, once the great champion of unity, who divides and weakens the party by his defense of Millérand, who annuls everything great he has ever done for Socialism by the mischief he is now working. * * * It is not sufficient to repudiate Millérand. That would be half-heartedness, if Jaurès is not repudiated at the same time. * * * The unity of the French Socialists can to-day be accomplished only against Jaurès, not with him."

Laguardelle, while agreeing with Kautsky's view of Jaurès' influence, does not think "we should fight any single individual. The opinions of men vary and are often changed surprisingly. We rather prefer to declare war to tendencies and systems, and we combat government Socialism by revolutionary Socialism."

The Parti Socialiste Français held its annual convention on March 2 to 4 in Tours. On the eve of this convention, five more federations severed their relations with it. The organization centered in "Le Mouvement Socialiste" did not attend, and an editorial remarks satirically: "It would be incorrect to say of the Parti Socialiste Français that it 'grows on its march.' The winds are rather contrary to it and fate unkind, for it 'decreases on its march.'" The official report does not state the number of organizations represented. The convention adopted a new program, consisting of a declaration of principles and a long string of political and economic "demands." The declaration of principles written by Jaurès is a queer conglomeration of Babouvist utopianism, Marxian determinism and Bernsteinian opportunism. Bernstein's pet theories of an increasing middle class and a gradual attenuation of the class struggle are, however, rejected, as shown by the following quotations: "All hope of augmenting property by increasing the number of independent small producers has disappeared. Great industries become more and more the rule in modern production. Thanks to the extension of the world market, to the growing facilities of transportation, to the increasing use of machinery, to the concentration of capital, the small and middle-class producers are gradually ruined by the immensely concentrated production and subordinated to it. Even in places where the number of small industrials, small dealers, small farm owners is not decreasing, their relative importance is waning. They become dependent on the great capitalists. Even the farm owners, who seem to have retained a little independence, are delivered up more and more to the oppressive forces of the world market that are handled without them and against them. * * * The immense increase of products and wealth, appropriated in

ever greater proportions by the parasite classes, has not brought an equivalent share to the proletariat. Whole classes of wage laborers are suddenly hurled into extreme misery by the continued improvement of the tools of production, by changes of locality, and the transformation of industries. * * * There is only one way to secure order and steady progress in production, the liberty of the individual and the growing welfare of the workingmen—the transfer of the tools of production to the collectivity.”

As means to this end are named “international union of workingmen; political and economic organization of the proletariat in a class party for the purpose of conquering the political power and socializing the means of production and distribution.”

In spite of the strictly Marxian premises, two-thirds of the program are then devoted to immediate demands. The program forgets only this, viz., that industrial evolution travels no longer by horse cart but by electricity, and that Europe must follow the pace set by the United States. A party that has to drag the weight of such a program behind it will soon be out of the race.

No resolution concerning the conduct of their deputies at the reception of the Czar was passed, but the representatives who had voted funds for the China expedition were reprimanded. A resolution was adopted declaring that the Millérand experiment should not be continued during the next legislature, unless a majority of the party decided otherwise. Such resolutions have no practical value, for the ministerialists have shown that they do not allow their principles to know what their practice is doing. And we are not surprised to hear that they intend to withdraw their candidates in certain election districts in favor of the radicals. Opportunism, like capitalism, is its own grave digger. It is plain that the disintegration of the Parti Socialiste Français will continue and that the aggressive Parti Ouvrier Français will be the dominating factor in the future.

Italy.

A few weeks ago the world was startled by the sensational report that the Socialists had declared the revolution, seized the railroads, forced the cabinet Zanardelli to abdicate and brought the king to the desperate extreme of “throwing himself into their arms” and decreeing the nationalization and municipalization of all industries from the making of bibs and baby carriages to coffins and burying. Nothing illustrates so well the utter incapacity of the bourgeois press to understand the meaning of proletarian activity as such Gulliver-like reports. What happened was simply a strike of the employees in the government railway service. They are organized and controlled by the Socialists like all labor organizations, and their class consciousness enables them to foil all capitalist tricks to deprive them of the fruits of economic organization. The cabinet, unable to uphold the bourgeois interests and unwilling to accede to the demands of the Socialists, resigned, and the government, fearing a revolution, resorted to the dangerous step of placing the strikers under military control by calling them to their regiments and running the railroads

under martial law. The strength of their organization was nevertheless sufficient to enforce all their demands. They might easily have made bloody use of the weapons given to them by the government. Yet, thanks to Socialist influence, they have learned to be careful of human lives and they understand that a majority of the whole nation is necessary to inaugurate and maintain a system of collective production. Their demands were granted, Zanardelli reconsidered his decision at the request of the king, Signor Costa was elected president of the chamber of deputies in place of the defeated government candidate Villa, and the "revolution" ended with a royal decree suspending martial law.

Belgium.

The Socialists, assisted by the majority of the liberals, are pushing their campaign for universal suffrage in the most vigorous manner. In the legislature, on the streets, in their press, they voice their demand in ringing tones of self-reliance, and the clerical government, conscious of its approaching defeat, is meeting them with very bad grace and ill-concealed malignancy. Hundreds of thousands of liberty-loving proletarians parade the streets, laugh at the puny police force and their unnecessary attempts to "keep order," and cheer the Socialists in front of royal, princely and priestly palaces. The national guards are in readiness, but the government places little reliance on them. The commanders have received strict orders to arrest every guardsman who hesitates to obey his officers, who refuses to shoot or who shoots into the air. No serious disturbance occurred so far.

Austria.

The bourgeois government has shown once more how little regard it has for the lives of the workingmen when the profits of the capitalists are threatened. The employes of the Lloyd (steamship company) in Trieste struck for higher wages and more humane conditions of life. Thoroughly organized and splendidly disciplined, they upheld their strike so masterfully that they won the sympathies of the entire working population. The capitalists, enraged and frenzied, lost their self-control and used the military power in the most brutal manner against unarmed men, women and children, killing and wounding a great number. The strikers held out, however, and the Lloyd was forced to make all the concessions demanded by them. This proletarian victory is so much more significant, as it was won by an international organization composed of Austrians, Italians and Slovenians.

Denmark.

In Esbjerg and Silkeborg, the Socialists won out in the municipal elections. In Esbjerg, all ten Socialist candidates were elected and none of the capitalist candidates. In Silkeborg, three Socialists and two Liberals won on a fusion ticket. Since the Liberals have become the ruling party, their opposition to the government has more and more relaxed, and the opposition in the Folkething rests now with the fourteen Socialist representatives.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Mark Hanna's Civic Federation is being condemned by working people from ocean to ocean. In Boston 20,000 men went on strike, the arbitrating meddlers stepped in, defeated the strikers, securing no concessions whatsoever, and to-day hundreds of them are walking the streets blacklisted. In San Francisco the iron and metal workers, after a nine months' battle, went back with the promise of a member of the Civic Federation that their grievances would be considered and concessions secured. Nothing has been done; the men have been abandoned and the bosses declare "there is nothing to arbitrate!" Easley's aggregation has just settled the National Cash Register Company trouble, but many metal polishers claim they got the worst of the deal. The garment workers of New York, whose conditions were bettered, we were told, declare such is not the case, and the civics claim to have secured the postponement of the papermakers' strike for improved conditions, probably until the employers can engage sufficient scabs. Keep an eye on Hanna's holy harmonizers.

Secretary Greenbaum, of the Socialist party, announces that the following new locals have been chartered: Yuma, Ariz.; Hennessy, Okla.; Burlington, Vt.; Burke, Ida.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Scrambler, Minn.; Emmett, Ida.; St. Anthony, Ida.; Spring Valley, Minn.; Kingston, Utah; Rigby, Ida.; Ogden, Utah; Lengby, Minn.; St. Hilare, Minn.; Hendrum, Minn.; Ada, Minn.; Elsinore, Utah; Eldred, Minn.; Tampa, Fla.; Chloride, Ariz.; Altman, Colo.; Delta, Colo.; Louisville, Utah; Silver City, Utah; Collinsville, I. T. State charters were granted to New Hampshire and Oklahoma, and several more applications are being considered. A National Propaganda Fund has been established, which is being supported quite liberally, and which will be used for the purpose of carrying the work of organization and education into unorganized localities. About twenty speakers are now busily at work in various States, and each one reports that increasing interest in Socialism is being shown by the people.

Active preparations are going forward in Western States to make the coming convention of the Western Labor Union in Denver next month the largest of its kind ever held in that section. Leading officers have sent a request to affiliated organizations to send their most intelligent and progressive members as delegates, as important matters will come up for consideration, among other things the proposition as to whether the olive branch shall be held out to the A. F. of L. or war declared. A Denver paper is authority for the statement that much

bitter feeling has been engendered among the Rocky Mountain trade unionists by some of the A. F. of L. officials acting with Hanna's Civic Federation, where six months ago the question of affiliating with the Eastern organization was growing in favor. The Western men hate the ground that Hanna and Grover Cleveland walk on, so to speak, and they suspiciously view the Civic Federation's meddling in labor affairs as a scheme to boost somebody's Presidential aspirations and to deliver the trade unionists into the hands of the enemy. The Denver convention this year will be watched with more than ordinary interest.

Packing-house employes in J. Sterling Morton's plant, at Nebraska City, Neb., went on strike for 17½ cents an hour. This is nothing unusual, except that G. Cleveland's friend, Morton, is said to have declared publicly that "a dollar a day is enough for any laboring man." Morton is not running for office this year. He has used workmen's votes in the past, however, and merely gives expression to what his kind of people believe, but are too cowardly to admit.

Chicago unionists charge that railroad corporations discharge men who have reached the age of 45 and in some cases 35 years. Like old railroad iron, they are dumped on the scrap-heap. Brother J. P. Morgan gets around the problem of disposing of worn-out workmen much more diplomatically and humanely. His D. L. & W. line disarms harsh critics by announcing from the housetops, so that all those who have ears may hear, that employes of the corporation who reach the age of 65 are retired on a pension. Thereupon Morgan's praises are sung by the capitalistic editor men, and he is vociferously pointed out as a great philanthropist. But, mark you, the word has also gone out that employes who have been in the service thirty-five years are to be discharged, and, as the men are not hired after they reach the age of 30, they may actually succeed in getting within smelling distance of that pension before their heads drop into the basket. The schemes of the capitalistic brethren would be very amusing sometimes if they were not so tragic.

In deciding a case that came up from Illinois the United States Supreme Court declared the anti-trust laws of thirteen States unconstitutional at one fell swoop. There is, as a consequence, weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth in the bailiwick of the trust-buster. Roosevelt's attack of the Northern Securities Company is regarded generally as a grand-stand play to rally the radical element of his party to his standard and to offset Hanna's popularity with the trust magnates and present flirtation with organized labor.

Supreme Court of New York has declared that funds of a mutual aid society cannot be voted for strike purposes, and unionists are wondering how far-reaching the decision will be.

The Reading Railroad Company, a branch of the anthracite coal combine, has decided that no more coal will be sold to commission men. The trust will wipe out those middle men and scoop in their profits. Confiscation!

Ex-State Senator Mainwaring, of Michigan, has seen the error of his

way and announces that he has become a Socialist. He is a wealthy lumberman and is now in Florida.

Connecticut Socialists are rigging up a wagon and will make agitation trips across country. Several California comrades are also traveling overland in a wagon making speeches and distributing literature.

It is reported that some of the Ohio daily papers have combined to aid each other when their printers go on strike.

Socialists of Erie, Pa., polled 3,145 votes, or one-third of the total, and came in second in the race at the recent municipal election. They elected a number of minor officers and are much encouraged. In New Castle, Pa., the Socialists made a clear gain of 20 per cent.

Coal trust has been formed in the Southwest, and here is what it will control: Fifty thousand acres of the choicest coal land in Missouri, Kansas, Indian Territory, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas and Wyoming, the labor power of 10,000 men, 45 developed mines, 23 pluck-me stores doing a business of \$2,000,000 alone, 2,500 company houses, or "shacks," mills turning out 180,000,000 feet of lumber annually, and scores of agencies and offices in various cities.

A new automatic street-sweeping machine has made its appearance in New York, which does the work of ten "white wings."

A technical glass journal says machinery has completely displaced the blowers in the manufacture of fruit jars and a large variety of wide-mouth ware. In the Indiana glass belt the workers are also reported as being considerably disturbed by a new machine that threatens to wipe out the skilled craftsmen in another branch of the industry.

Within a short period the billion-dollar octopus will gobble up the \$20,000,000 Monongahela soft-coal combine and also another small steel combine with \$20,000,000 capital.

Unionists of Portland, Ore., were injunctioned because they paraded a boycott banner about the streets.

New York Socialists are enthusiastically raising a fund to start a daily paper. A fund of \$50,000 is to be collected for that purpose.

Brother Schwab, of the "Peace Conference," appeared before the Senate committee having the eight-hour bill in charge and argued eloquently against it.

Match trust has started a big factory in Manilla. Cheap labor.

Censor Madden has forbidden the publishers of the American Federationist from printing the union label on the cover.

So much new labor-saving machinery is to be installed at the various lake ports this season, says a dispatch from Ashtabula, one of the most important ports on the lakes, that provisions will have to be made to find employment for the ore and coal handlers who will be displaced. Automatic unloaders, which were in use at only two points last year, will be in operation at nearly every ore-receiving harbor this year, and each one will displace from eighty to ninety men. The pneumatic grain scoop, which has already been described in these pages, will also be introduced at ports where there are elevators. The scoop lifts 1,500 pounds at a time, and twelve men will do the work that formerly required forty.

The name of the Workers' Call has been changed to Chicago Socialist.

Since the Socialist party won the election in Northport, Wash., the Republican-Democratic combine has made several unsuccessful attempts to drive out the victors by arming the scabs in the smelters and resorting to force.

Master painters of Philadelphia combined to smash the union. Brewery bosses of New England united "to regulate wages."

Western labor union officials are sending circular letters throughout the East warning workmen to pay no attention to advertisements booming the West and holding out glowing promises of prosperity. The circulars state that the railways and land speculators merely desire to rob people ignorant of the true conditions of their money and then abandon them.

The evil day, long postponed, has come. The fight between reactionary craft autonomy and broad industrialism broke out in Cincinnati, where the brewery workers were forced to go on strike because they refused to give up jurisdiction over engineers and firemen employed in breweries. The latter are supported by the employers, while the brewery workers are backed almost solidly by the union people of other trades. This question of jurisdiction has been up before the A. F. of L. for years, but was dodged as regularly as it was introduced. What the outcome of the present bitter struggle will be cannot be predicted at this writing, except that the brewery workers are determined to wage it to the finish. The principle that they stand upon must ultimately triumph.

The anthracite miners have filed their demands. They want the eight-hour day, recognition of their committees, and declare they will not work with non-union men, and also want minor grievances adjusted. It is now up to Morgan. Daily dispatches from New York state that the operators will not yield, and strike talk is in the air.

The labor problem is about to be solved. In an address at Hartford, Conn., Judge S. E. Baldwin, professor in Yale Law School, said American workmen eat too much and save too little of their earnings. He argued that a single workman earning \$1.50 per day should save 25 cents of that amount, and should never marry until he had accumulated \$100. Judge Baldwin said workmen eat too much meat and not enough fruit, and that two meals a day should do them. He also opined that the American toiler spends too much money on dress and on the furnishing of his home. Judge Baldwin's wonderful discovery of how to get rich has not yet been patented.

The judiciary committee of the Senate has reported the anti-injunction bill, and it will soon be up for discussion and action. The committee reports favorably upon the bill as originally introduced—but an amendment has been attached that practically kills it and leaves matters just as they are at present. The eight-hour and Chinese exclusion bills are still being juggled with, powerful lobbies being at work to defeat them or destroy their vital features.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Co-operation in Publishing.

In the February Review we asked our readers to subscribe for shares in the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company at ten dollars each. The response was prompt and gratifying. Sixty-one shares from forty different subscribers have been taken since the first of the year, and a new impulse has thus been given to the circulation of Socialist literature.

Books Now Ready.

The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons, published in February, is being received with enthusiasm by Socialists in the farming districts, and at the same time is recognized by the most conservative critics as a distinct addition to the literature of American economics. For example, the Boston Transcript says: "Mr. Simons shows a thorough knowledge of his subject and a command of many authorities," and the Louisville Courier-Journal says: "This book is well worth reading, not only by the farmer but by every one interested in or connected with the farmer in business. The chapter upon 'The South' is carefully written and impartially intelligent." The book is published in cloth only, in the Standard Socialist series. Price 50 cents; to stockholders 30 cents, postpaid.

"American Communities," by William Alfred Hinds, which has been announced in previous issues of The Review, and the publication of which was unavoidably delayed, is now ready. It is a volume of 450 pages, including seventeen full-page engravings, and it is beyond all comparison the fullest and most authentic account of American experiments in co-operative colonies. The author has in the main refrained from drawing any general conclusions, his object being rather to supply the facts, and we believe that our readers will agree that this has been done admirably. A complete copy of the table of contents will be sent to any one requesting it. The price of the book is \$1; to stockholders 60 cents, postpaid.

"The Pride of Intellect," by Franklin H. Wentworth, editor of the Socialist Spirit, is the thirty-fourth number of the Pocket Library of Socialism. These booklets, presenting the Socialist thought in a great variety of forms, are well worth the retail price, 5 cents each, but we offer them to our stockholders at \$1 a hundred, postpaid.

The second book of Plato's Republic, translated by Alexander Kerr, Professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin, is now ready. The first book of this great work, of which we issued an edition last year, deals mainly with the general theory of the state in its relation to ethics. The second book, which is now for the first time offered to English readers in readable and inexpensive shape, contains a considerable portion of the speculations as to the details of an ideal commonwealth for which Plato's Republic is famous. The translation has been highly commended by some of the best critics in the United States. The second book is published in style uniform with the first. Price 15 cents; to stockholders 8 cents, postpaid.

Another pamphlet, covering a wholly different field from any of our other publications, is "The Economic Foundation of Art," by A. M. Simons. This is printed in an artistic little booklet from beautiful old-style types, and shows how useless are all efforts at artistic workmanship within our present society and how essential it is that all those who are interested in the "arts and crafts" and similar movements should be identified with the political Socialist movement. It is also a fundamental analysis of the relation of art to social and economic life, and thus combines all the features necessary for an educational and propaganda work among those interested in any form of artistic work. Price 5 cents; to stockholders \$2.50 a hundred, postpaid.

Books in Press.

"Love's Coming of Age," by Edward Carpenter, is a notable book, treating in a frank and rational manner the important subject of the relation of the sexes in the past, present and future. Nothing is more certain than that the economic changes now in progress will inevitably cause corresponding changes in marriage and sex relations, and we know of no writer who has discussed the subject in a manner so deserving of attention as Edward Carpenter. Our edition of this book is now in press and will be ready for delivery about April 20. The book will be handsomely bound in extra cloth. The price, including postage, will be \$1, to stockholders 60 cents.

About the same time we shall bring out "The Last Days of the Ruskin Commonwealth," by Prof. Isaac Broome. The author was a member of the colony, and while far above the intellectual level of the Ruskin colonists, he was and is far removed from the aims and philosophy of scientific Socialism. For this very reason this book, which exposes the general rottenness of the famous colony, is all the more valuable testimony, since it bears unwilling witness to the truth of the view held all along by international Socialists of the futility of colony schemes. It is bound in cloth and illustrated with sixteen full-page engravings. Price 50 cents; to stockholders 30 cents, postpaid.

Books in Preparation.

Other important works are practically ready to put in the hands of our printers, and will only be delayed until the necessary capital can be subscribed. First among them should be mentioned a translation by

Ernest Untermann of the "Origin of the Family, the State and Private Property," by Frederick Engels. This is one of the classics of Socialism and has already been translated into nearly every civilized language except English. Ours, however, is the first English translation, and every American Socialist will surely want the book as soon as it appears. It will be published in the Standard Socialist series at 50 cents.

We have just concluded an arrangement with Robert Blatchford, the author of "Merrie England," for the American rights in his forthcoming work, "Britain for the British." The title of this work might have been equally well "America for the Americans," since its object is to show how in every civilized country there is a small owning class "in useless luxury and pernicious idleness" and a large working class in a state of "drudging toil, of wearing poverty and anxious care." The book is a much stronger one than "Merrie England." It will be published in paper at 25 cents and in cloth at 50 cents, subject to the usual discount to our stockholders.

Another important work is a translation of the new history of the German "Social Democracy," a review of which appears on another page.

Capital Needed.

To bring out this literature without delay we need a rapid increase of our capital stock. The low price at which we are supplying books to stockholders makes it necessary to raise the first cost of the plates of each new book by stock subscriptions.

About 400 shares of stock at \$10 each still remain for sale. The money realized from this will enable us to extend rapidly the list of standard Socialist works offered to our stockholders at cost, and also to reduce our prices to a scale even lower than the present one. No profit from the sale of Socialist literature by this company goes to any individual. The officers as well as the employees are working for what their labor would bring in the market, and in fact the officers have hitherto gone without part of their wages to help supply the capital needed to extend the company's work. A certain amount of interest is still being paid on borrowed capital, but the rapid increase of stock subscriptions should soon enable us to save this item of outlay and apply it to the increase of our stock of books.

Do you want to increase the Socialist vote in your own town, city or State next fall? The way to do it is to scatter Socialist literature from now until election, and the way to get the greatest amount of literature for your money is to join in our co-operative plan. Ten dollars is all that is required to make you a stockholder. If you have not already received the booklet entitled "How Socialist Literature Is Published," ask for it and it will be mailed to you.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth avenue, Chicago.